# A HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE MAHĀVAMSA.

Chapters I - XX.

by

G.C.MENDIS.

Thesis submitted for Ph.D. Degree (Internal)
June 1930.

G.C. Mendis
Ph. D
History
1930

# CONTENTS.


| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chapter | I. | Introduction. | 3 |
| " | II. | Yakkhas, Nāgas, and other Non-human Beings. | 26 |
| " | III. | The Visits of the Buddha. | 45 |
| " | IV. | The Genealogy of the Buddha. | 54 |
| " | V. | Asoka. | 66 |
| " | VI. | The Buddhist Councils, Sects, Patriarchs and Missions. | 85 |
| " | VII. | Vijaya and the Origin of the Sinhalese. | 120 |
| " | VIII. | Paṇḍuvasudeva, Abhaya, and Paṇḍukābhaya. | 136 |
| " | IX. | Mahinda and Devānaṃpiya Tissa. | 159 |


## Appendix.


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | The Chronology of the Mahāvaṃsa. | 190 |
| II. | The Dīpavaṃsa : A Textual Criticism. | 201 |

## A Historical Criticism of the Mahāvaṃsa.

### Chapters I-XX.

The Mahāvaṃsa is a Pāli epic written about the sixth century A.D. in Ceylon. Its chief source was an old Sinhalese chronicle, which formed a part of the old Sinhalese commentaries on the Pāli Canon. The Sinhalese chronicle seems to have been based on the older ballads in the Dīpavaṃsa written by different persons during the early centuries of our era. These chronicles are indebted for some of their material to the Jātakas, the Aśokāvadāna, some parts of the Pāli Canon, and the Sinhalese commentaries on them.

After the death of the Buddha his teachings and the rules he laid down were collected. They were amplified and added to as time passed. The first centre of Buddhism was Rājagaha, and then Vesāli. Next it spread westwards to Kosambī, and from there north-west to Mathurā and Kashmir and south-west to Vidisā and Ujjein. In course of time, though the continuity of the tradition was maintained, Buddhism in each new place became modified according to environment and influence of new teachers. Thus arose the different schools. The Theravādins, who went to Vidisā and Ujjein, reached Ceylon in the time of Asoka. They occupied caves at Mihintale, Vessagiri, Isurumūṇiya and other places. Before long the thūpa built to the south of Anurādhapura, and the Bo-tree in the Mahāmeghavana became centres of worship.

The Vāddas, a tribe akin to the Irulas of South India were the first settlers in Ceylon then called Tambapaṇṇi. They retreated to the mountains when new peoples who spoke an Aryan dialect occupied the north-west, the south-~~west~~ east, and the territory watered by the Malwatte

Oya and the Mahāvāliganga. Many of the new-comers belonged to the Sinhala tribe, which gave its name to the people and then to the island. Mantota was their chief port and Anurādhapura became their chief town. When Buddhism was brought to Ceylon the Sinhalese king was Tissa. He and his successor Uttiya supported the new religion.

## Chapter I.

# INTRODUCTION.

## Introduction.

The Mahāvaṃsa as a literary work has been dealt with very fully by Prof. Geiger in his work: "The Dīpavaṃsa and Mahāvaṃsa." He discusses also its value as a historical work both in this book as well as in his Introduction to the English translation of the Mahāvaṃsa.

### I.

According to Prof. Geiger's Introduction to the translation of the Mahāvaṃsa (Mhvs) (p.X), at the close of the fourth century A.D. there was a sort of chronicle of the history of the island from its legendary beginnings onwards. It was part of the Aṭṭhakathā or the old commentary literature on the Buddhist canonical writings, which formed the basis of the later Pāli commentaries. It was, like the Aṭṭhakathā, composed in Old-Sinhalese prose probably mingled with verses in the Pāli language. This Aṭṭhakathā Mhvs existed in the Mahāvihāra and in other monasteries, but the various recensions differed in details. The chronicle originally came down from the arrival of Mahinda in Ceylon, and was continued most probably down to the time of Mahāsena, with whose reign both the Dīpavaṃsa (Dpvs) and the Mhvs come to an end. The Dpvs composed at the close of the fourth century A.D. presents the first clumsy redaction in Pāli verses. It is the Mhvs of the ancients referred to at the beginning of the Mhvs. The Mhvs is a new treatment of the subject,

but shows greater skill in the employment of the Pāli language. It is a more artistic composition and makes a more liberal use of the material contained in the original work. The historical introduction to the Samanta-pāsādikā (Smp) is based on the Dpvs, but it is made more complete with additions which could only have been drawn directly from the Aṭṭhakathā. The Mahāvaṃsa Ṭīkā ( M Ṭ) gives further information from the original work.

Oldenberg, who edited the Dpvs in 1879, was of the opinion (p.6) that the author of the Dpvs borrowed from the Aṭṭhakathā, not only the materials of his own work but sometimes the mode of expression and even whole lines, word for word. "In fact," he continues, "a great part of the Dpvs has the appearance not of an independent continuous work, but of a composition of such single stanzas extracted from a work or works like that Aṭṭhakathā; many of the repetitions and omissions which render some chapters of the Dīpavaṃsa almost illegible, we may account for not by the inadvertence of the copyists, but by this peculiar method of compilation." He further adds that the Dpvs and the Mhvs "are indeed in the main nothing but two versions of the same substance, both being based on the historical introduction to the great Commentary of the

Mahāvihāra. Each work represented, of course, their common subject in its own way, the Dīpavaṃsa following step by step and almost word for word the traces of the original, the Mahāvaṃsa proceeding with much greater independence and perfect literary mastership. The Dīpavaṃsa, as regards its style and its grammatical peculiarities, betrays the characteristics of an age in which the Sinhalese first tried to write in the dialect of the sacred texts brought over from India; there are passages in the Dīpavaṃsa which remind us of the first clumsy attempts of the ancient German tribes to write Latin. The Mahāvaṃsa is composed very differently. Its author masters the Pāli grammar and style with a perfect ease which cannot have been acquired but after fruitless attempts, and which may be compared with the elegant mastership of Latin composition by which the Italian poets and scholars of the renaissance excelled. The turning-point between the ancient and the modern epoch of Pāli literature in Ceylon is marked, no doubt, by the great works of Buddhaghosa, which were not less important from a literary than from a theological point of view."

Franke (J.P.T.S. 1908 - 1909, p.1) refused to believe that the Dpvs, the Smp and the Mhvs were based on any

ancient chronicle. He held the view that the authors of the Smp and the Mhvs based their works on the Dpvs, and that the Dpvs, in the absence of any sources "must be considered as standing unsupported on its own tottering feet." Franke first expressed his views in Literarisches Centralblatt, 1906, No.37, column 1275. What he found impossible to believe was that Mahinda brought the Aṭṭhakathā with him, and that the material in the Dpvs dealing with the history of Buddhism in India and the establishing of Buddhism in Ceylon went back to his time. The following year he made a closer examination of the Dpvs and its relations to the Smp and the Mhvs in the Wiener Zeitschrift f.d. Kunde des Morgent (Vol. XXI, p.203 and p.307). He quoted passages from the Pāli Canon to indicate the sources of numerous verses in the Dpvs, and showed that in language it was influenced much by the Buddhavaṃsa (Bu), the Cariyāpiṭaka, (Cp) and the Jātākas. He also expressed the view that not only was the author of the Dpvs strongly influenced by the ideas of these works, but also that the Dpvs was only a botched compilation of Pāli quotations of these and other works of the Pāli Canon.

A study of the Chronicles leave no doubt that at least certain parts of the Dpvs, such as the accounts of the Councils, the chronology of the Indian kings, and the Buddhist Missions,

do not stand on their own tottering feet, but are either based on other records or are supported by inscriptions. It is also equally clear that there was a sort of chronicle in Old-Sinhalese which was made use of by the authors of the Smp, the Mhvs, and the M Ṭ. The views of Franke, however, cannot be dismissed altogether. A closer examination and a comparison of the Dpvs, Smp and the Mhvs, show that though their contents deal with the earliest period of the history of Buddhism in India and the establishment of Buddhism in Ceylon, the accounts themselves belong to a period much later than the time of Mahinda, and that it is worth considering how far the Dpvs is based on a written work.

In the Dpvs itself nothing is said about its sources, but some passages in it are quoted in the M Ṭ as said by the ancients (Tenāhū porāṇā). One of these passages, the first three lines of the Dpvs, says: "Listen to me. I shall proclaim the history of the coming of the Buddha to the island, the coming of the relics and of the Bodhi-tree, the coming to the island of the doctrine (sāsana) and the teaching of the collections and of the teachers, and the coming of the chief of men." It is evident that the contents of the Dpvs are much more than these. It does not deal merely with the visits

of the Buddha, the bringing of the relics and the Bodhi-tree, the bringing of Buddhism, the Pāli Canon, and the Aṭṭhakathā, and the coming of Mahinda, but also with the kings of Ceylon and their activities.

In the Smp there are three quotations from the sayings of the ancients. The first quotation (p.62) gives a list of the Theras of Ceylon who handed down the Vinaya. This list is not given in the Dpvs, but it appears on p.2 of the Parivāra. The second and the third passages (pp.70 - 71) deal with the coming of Mahinda, and they are also found in the Dpvs. On pp. 75 - 76 of the Smp there are some more quotations, but they are said to be from the Dpvs. They deal with the relations between Asoka and Devānampiya Tissa, a subject which is not included in the contents recorded in the first three lines of the Dpvs. All the quotations from the sayings of the ancients in the M Ṭ do not occur in the Dpvs. In the Visuddhi Magga and the Pāli commentaries also there are quotations which are said to be sayings of the ancients. They deal with various subjects and are by no means limited to historical matter. The quotations are usually in verse, but prose passages are not unknown. In the Sadhamma Saṃgaho (J.P.T.S. 1890 p.57) verses, which occur also

in the Cūlavaṃsa, dealing with events of the fifth century A.D., are called sayings of the ancients. Hence the sayings of the ancients do not seem to have referred to any definite work but to any statement which was considered old. Nevertheless it is strange that the author of the Smp should call sayings of the ancients two passages found also in the Dpvs and call others quotations from the Dpvs. The author of the Mhvs also refers to a work of the ancients (I. 2) but he refers nowhere to the Dpvs itself.

Oldenberg, though he believed that the Dpvs was based on the Aṭṭhakathā, was also of opinion that it was not a continuous work but a composition of single stanzas extracted from a work or works like the Aṭṭhakathā. He also attributes the repetitions and omissions to this peculiar method of compilation. The Dpvs is undoubtedly a compilation. The contents are not the work of one composer and different parts have been composed at different times. This is evident from the variety of style. Some passages, if interpolations are omitted, are free from irregularities in metre and mistakes in grammar, while others are irregular in metre and grammatically weak. Some, like the accounts of Paṇḍuvasudeva, Abhaya, and Pandukābhaya, and parts of the story of Vijaya, give only a summary of the story. Other accounts like the visits of the

Buddha and the bringing of the Bodhi-tree, are narrated in greater detail. Some at least of the double accounts seem to be derived from two different sources. The accounts of the Buddhist Councils show that the first accounts belonged to one group and the second accounts to another. The memorial verses explain how some of the stories were remembered before the ballads themselves were composed. Some parts, such as the account of the life of the Buddha, seem to have been based on Pāli prose passages of the Canon. Some accounts have one part in one metre and another part in another metre. It is often quite clear that couplets have been introduced to connect such independent ballads or parts of ballads. Some passages give only speeches without any mention of the speakers, while others which give the speakers seem to represent a more developed form of such verses. Most of the sentences which are expressed in a single line, many lines consisting of epithets only, many lines occurring in sentences which are expressed in three lines, many lines either grammatically or metrically wrong, and many lines, which obviously consist of commentarial matter, seem to be later additions.

Hence the Dpvs does not seem to be a clumsy attempt at composition in Pāli verse at the close of the fourth century A.D., but a compilation of ballads or verses of the ancients, which belonged to different periods of time. It is also significant that the word Dpvs occurs nowhere in the work, and it seems to be due to the fact that it

is not the composition of a single author but a compilation of verses on different subjects. Perhaps the oldest verses dealt only with those subjects enumerated at the beginning of the Dpvs. To this was then added the stories about Asoka and the Ceylon kings and the activities of Mahinda; and in this final form the work was called the Dpvs. There is no reason to doubt that these ballads existed in a written form in one or more Aṭṭhakathā. Perhaps there were more than one version of them as the quotations in the Smp and the MṬ often differ a little from those in the Dpvs text. It is difficult to say whether the ballads themselves were based on a written work. The Old-Sinhalese Aṭṭhakathā is no longer available, and not enough is known about it to draw ~~to~~ any definite conclusion. Nor is it possible to say anything about the whole of the Dpvs as it is neither the composition of one man nor belongs to one definite period.

According to the author of the Smp (p.2) the sources of his work were the Mahāṭṭhakathā, the Mahāpaccarī, and other Aṭṭhakathās such as the Kurundī. The reason for writing this Pāli work is that the explanations in the language of the Sīhaladīpa were of no use to the bhikkhus on the continent (dīpa). The old chronicle, therefore, was a work in Sinhalese and the Pāli verse quotations in the Smp probably existed in it..

The author of the MṬ (p.25) says that the Mhvs is the equivalent of the Porāṇaṭṭhakathā, which belonged to the Mahāvihāra, but the latter, unlike the Mhvs, was a prose work in the Sinhalese dialect.

He also adds that the Mahāvaṃsa of the ancients referred to in the Pāli Mahāvaṃsa is this work, and that it contained the faults of over-condensation, prolixity, and repetition. The language of this work, as also the early inscriptions show, could not have been very different from Pāli, as the author of the M Ṭ says the Mhvs has the correct Pāli word pavakkhāmi instead of the Sinhalese word vakkhāmi, which occurs in the Pāli Thūpavaṃsa.

Both the Smp and the Mhvs were based, therefore, on the same work. This, perhaps, explains why the accounts in them are so similar, and hardly ever contradict each other. The Mhvs certainly gives more information about most matters dealt with in the Smp, but its accounts are only an expanded account of the material in the Smp. It is most likely that the additional material was included in the Aṭṭhakathā after the Smp was composed.

Prof. Geiger is of opinion that the Smp is based on the Dpvs, though the author of the Smp makes it clear that he followed a Sinhalese work. The Smp is certainly closer to the Dpvs than the Mhvs both in language and in the order of events, but many parts of the Dpvs, however, belong to an earlier strata of tradition than those of the Smp and the Mhvs. It mentions fewer places visited by the Buddha. It makes no mention of Tissa, the brother of Asoka, and says that Asoka killed all his brothers. Sumana is not the son of Saṃghamittā but of her sister. It knows of a

western sea-route from India to Ceylon but not of an eastern sea-route like the Smp and the Mhvs. The author of the M Ṭ never refers to these differences between the Dpvs and the Mhvs, though he is careful enough to note all differences between the Mhvs and other works such as the Smp and the Aṭṭhakathās of the Mahāvihāra and the Uttaravihāra. If the Dpvs was based on the Aṭṭhakathā written in Sinhalese, there would have been some traces in the Aṭṭhakathā of the older tradition which is represented in the Dpvs; and it is strange that the author of the M Ṭ makes no reference to them at all.

It is most likely that the oldest ballads of the Dpvs were based on an oral tradition and were recited from memory at first. They were then either written down separately or were put together by some person. Then someone else utilising these ballads wrote down this historical account in Sinhalese prose, making revisions and additions wherever necessary according to the light of later knowledge, and generally keeping to the order of the old verses and its language whenever possible. The author of the Smp also kept as far as possible to the order and the language of the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā in composing his work, and also included additional material which he found in other works. The fact that he quotes the Dpvs shows that a work called the Dpvs

existed at the time, though it may not have been so complete as the present work. The verses he quotes as sayings of the ancients probably were also quotations in the Sinhalese account. Hence the oldest work is a collection of the greater part of the ballads in the Dpvs. Then came the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā Mahāvaṃsa. This was followed by the Smp and the Mhvs.

According to Prof. Geiger the next work connected with the history of Ceylon is the Mahāvaṃsa Ṭīkā, the Vaṃsatthappakāsinī. The word ṭīkā came into use in Sanskrit for a commentary in the ninth century A.D. In Pāli it is always the name for a sub-commentary. The Paṭhama-Paramatthappakāsinī, for instance, is the Ṭīkā to the Atthasālinī, the commentary to the Dhammasaṅgani.

No Aṭṭhakathā or Commentary of the Mhvs, apart from the M Ṭ, has been discovered so far. The author of the M Ṭ sometimes speaks of the ancient Mahāvaṃsa of the Sīhalaṭṭhakatha, sometimes of the Aṭṭhakathā, and sometimes of the Mahāvaṃsa Aṭṭhakathā. The passages he quotes, however, are not sufficient to draw a conclusion as to whether these refer to one or more works, or whether the Mahāvamsa Aṭṭhakathā was a distinct work from the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā. He also mentions a Dīpavaṃsa Aṭṭhakathā, but this work is no longer available. Therefore it is possible that the M Ṭ was preceded by another work called the Mahāvaṃsa Aṭṭhakathā.

The M Ṭ is a very valuable work for the study of the Mhvs. It not only gives one some idea of the main source of the Mhvs, the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā, but also refers to many other works that existed at the time. The additional material it gives, and the sources to which much of it is traced, gives one some insight how the early traditions grew, andhow the accounts when once written down came to be amplified.

Some parts of the Ceylon tradition can be traced to still earlier works. The Jātakas including the Cariyāpiṭaka seems to have been the chief source of the verses and the writings, which the authors of the Dpvs, the Smp, and the Mhvs utilised. They are also the accounts that have influenced most the language of the Dpvs. Some of the stories and episodes in all the three works such as those of Vijaya, Paṇḍukābhaya and Nigrodha have been either borrowed from or have been based upon them, while many an account has been amplified with details found in them.

It is difficult to say whether the writers of the ballads of the Dpvs knew the Aśokāvadāna, though they seem to have been aware of some of the stories contained in it. A considerable portion of the material in the Smp and the Mhvs, however, seems to have been borrowed from it directly or indirectly. The Aśokāvadāna is also a work which has grown with time. New episodes

have been added to it and the accounts that existed originally have been amplified. The Smp and the Mhvs show that the later forms of this work were known in Ceylon.

After the Jātakas, the work that influenced the language of the Dpvs most was the Buddhavaṃsa, and some details in the Dpvs can be traced also to it. The Bu, like the Jātakas, is not a historical work but a work of imagination. It shows that at this time the practice of using an imaginative or historical account of one person as a model for describing the lives of others had come into vogue. The attempt made in the Mahāpadāna Suttanta is carried out more fully here.

The infuence of many other Buddhist works also can be seen in the Ceylon traditions. The chief of them are the Commentaries, the Mahāvagga and the Cullavagga of the Vinaya Pitaka, and the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta.

For reasons already given it is not possible to give a definite date to the Dpvs. Some parts of it,like the visits of the Buddha, may belong to the first century B.C. while the predictions about the buildings of the Mahāvihāra may be later than the Smp itself. The references in the Dpvs to the marking of the boundaries of the Thūpārāma derived from the Sīmākathā and to the writing down of the Pāli scriptures are clearly interpolations even in the Mhvs.

The language of the Dpvs shows that most parts of it have been influenced by the Bu and the Cp, but unfortunately no serious attempt has yet been made to fix the dates of these works. Perhaps it will not be far wrong if it is concluded that the ballads of the Dpvs belong to a period ranging from the first century B.C. to the fifth century A.D.

The Smp Introduction seems to be a work of a single person. It is quite possible there are many interpolations in it, but it is more difficult to detect them in a prose work. There is no doubt that it belongs to a period earlier than that of the Mhvs. If according to tradition it is a work of Buddhaghosa it belongs to the fifth century A.D.

It is more difficult to fix the date of the Mhvs. It is a work later than the Smp, but seems to be earlier than the Sumaṅgala Vilāsinī. In the Sumaṅgala Vilāsinī, unlike the Smp but like the Mhvs, Moggaliputta Tissa tells Asoka, if he wants to be a kinsman of the religion he must let his son or dsughter enter the saṃgha, but the account of the funeral ceremonies in it is a more developed form than those of the Smp and the Mhvs, as the funeral ceremonies, according to it, lasted two weeks, and the offerings to the relics went on for another week.

In the M Ṭ the author of the Mhvs is always called

ācāriya though sometimes other theras are mentioned by name (p.29); but at the end of the work (p.502) in a badly constructed passage, which seems to be a later addition, the author of the Mhvs is said to be Mahānāma of the pariveṇa built by the commander of the troops, Dīghasanda. According to the Mhvs XV. 212-213, Dīghasandana was the commander of the troops of Devanaṃpiya Tissa. He built a pāsāda for Mahinda and this pariveṇa called the Dīghasandasenāpati-pariveṇa, was a part of the Mahāvihara, and was the home of renowned men. According to the Cūlavaṃsa XXXVIII. 16, the uncle of King Dhātusena lived in this pariveṇa, but there is nothing to show that his name was Mahānāma. A thera by the name of Mahānāma is mentioned in Cūlavaṃsa XXXIX. 42 but according to the readings given by Prof. Geiger he lived in Dīghāsana or Dīghāṇa parivena. Therefore these two theras need not be the same. Even if the author of the Mhvs was a thera called Mahānāma, it does not help one to fix the date of the Mhvs. Perhaps Professor Geiger is not wrong in placing it in the sixth century A.D.

There is also no definite evidence to fix the date of the M Ṭ. It cannot be earlier than the seventh century A.D. as King Dāṭhopatissa II is mentioned. On p.294 M Ṭ mentions the Mahābodhivaṃsakathā. If this work is the same as the Mahābodhivaṃsa the M Ṭ is later than the tenth century A.D. The Pāli

Thūpavaṃsa, written about the middle of the thirteenth century, mentions the M Ṭ, and the author of the M Ṭ did not know of the later addition to the Mhvs (Dpvs and Mhvs, p.34). The style of the M Ṭ is quite different from the earlier Pāli commentaries, and shows strong influence of Sanskrit. Therefore Professor Geiger is perhaps correct when he places it between 1000 and 1250 A.D.

II.

At the present day an account of an event written even by a contemporary writer is not necessarily considered accurate, and in judging his work one must take into account his life and character. Any critic of his work must know something of his powers of observation and judgement, the range of his knowledge, and the extent to which his inferences are influenced by his past experiences. When it is so difficult to judge the work of a contemporary writer it is clear how much more difficult it is to judge the accuracy of statements handed down by tradition. Often it is difficult to notice the changes a tradition undergoes during the course of centuries. Sometimes there may be very little evidence to detect how much of it has been forgotten and how much has been added to it, or whether it has undergone a complete transformation as a result of it passing through different types of minds.

It has also to be remembered that those who wrote down tradition in past ages were hardly ever seekers after a literary reputation, and had less reason to be careful than modern writers. They did not consider it wrong to borrow from other accounts without making any acknowledgement. They did not hesitate to correct statements which seemed wrong to them or to add details which they thought had been omitted. They had no books of reference to verify their statements, or maps to make sure of the positions of places or the distances between them. Numbers meant little to them and they did not think it wrong to insert them where they were lacking or to alter them if necessary. Moreover it is possible for a writer of a later time to give to his sources a meaning quite different from that which their authors had in mind. He may take literally a purely imaginative work of a poet or interpret a story in fiction as history. For instance, it is very likely that the oldest ballads, the contents of which are given at the beginning of the Dpvs, were merely works of imagination, especially as the writers of them seem to have been influenced strongly by the ideas of such works as the Jātākas and the Buddhavaṃsa. Their authors could not have meant them to be historical ballads. There is no historical foundation for the stories of the visits of the Buddha. Mahinda could not have come by air to Ceylon.

The bringing of the collar-bone of the Buddha from Sakka, who did not belong to the world of men, cannot be conceived as an actual event. The story of the bringing of the Bo-tree does not seem to be historical. It is not difficult, however, to understand why in later centuries these accounts were taken for actual events. At the time the Ceylon chronicles were written down there was no scientific investigation of the laws of nature, and miracles were only wonderful events. The Buddhists at this time believed in the omniscience of the Buddha, the supernatural powers of arahants, in destiny, and the influence of non-human agencies. According to their ideas there were a number of upper-worlds and the beings of these regions were similar to human beings in many ways and were able to communicate with and influence the actions of the beings of this world. Therefore it is not strange that they took for facts the visits and the predictions of the Buddha, the flight of Mahinda, the obtaining of the collar-bone of the Buddha from Sakka, and the part played by the nāgas and the devas during the bringing of the Bo-tree.

Further a story composed to express an abstract idea in a concrete form or a story narrated for the purpose of edification may be taken for an actual historical incident. The story in which Asoka is told by Moggaliputta Tissa that he cannot be a kinsman of Buddhism unless he allows his own begotten son to

enter the Saṃgha, expresses a deep spiritual truth, but it is perhaps no more historically true than the well-known verse, St.John III. 16: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten son that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life." Many accounts such as these seem to have been connected with historical persons to make stories more real. On the other hand many legends, such as that of Tissa, have also been transformed to teach religious truths.

Historical truth in the past has been sacrificed also to make a story more vivid or more interesting. Details with regard to places, as those in the story of Vijaya, certainly make them more real. The speeches attributed to Devānaṃpiya Tissa and Mahinda make the accounts more dramatic. The story how Duṭṭhagāmaṇī when a boy expressed his dissatisfaction with the occupation of Ceylon by the Tamils, must have appealed to a people of a later age who constantly suffered at the hands of Tamil invaders.

Another habit in ancient times was to attribute to a person certain actions already related about others. The life of Nigrodha in the Dpvs and the Mhvs seems to have been constructed in this way. It was also the practice to model the story of the life of a person or an event on others already well known. The early ~~life~~ lives of Nāgasena, Moggaliputta Tissa, Dāsaka, and Buddhaghosa seem to have been based on such a model, and the acc

of the acceptance of the Mahāvihāra seems to have been based on the account about the Veḷuvanavihāra.

The sacrifice of historical truth for purposes of edification and of effect has not been peculiar to the Buddhists. The Jews attributed the Pentateuch to Moses to give it authority and a venerable antiquity. They tried to impress upon others the importance of certain events by connecting them with existing statements in the Scriptures, by inventing predictions, and by associating them with earthquakes and voices from Heaven. The Christians traced the genealogy of Jesus to King David and then to Adam, and connected his birth with the appearance of a special star. The Buddhists seem to have been influenced by similar ideas. They credited Buddha himself with most of the works of the Pāli Canon. They attributed to him predictions about the future of Buddhism. They traced his genealogy back to the mythical king Mahāsammata. They associated great teachers of Buddhism with the great Emperor Asoka, and great events with earthquakes and other unusual events.

It must also not be forgotten that the main object of the author of the Mhvs was not to record the history of Buddhism or the activities of kings. He did not write a history but an epic. Just as Milton wrote the Paradise Lost to reveal the ways of God to man, the author of the Mhvs wrote his work to produce serene

joy and religious emotion in the hearts of pious people. According to the M Ṭ (p.31) the Mhvs is so called because it deals with such subjects as the visits of the Buddha. When people are told about the Buddha and what he did in Ceylon serene joy is produced in their hearts. They are roused by religious emotion when they realise the impermanence of life by hearing of the deaths of the Buddha, his disciples and the kings. Hence the aim of the author of the Mhvs was to proclaim not historical but religious truths. His chief object was not to record history but to edify people.

Therefore it is not strange that the Mhvs contains very little history, and if anyone is disappointed with it as a historical work, it is not the author of the Mhvs that is to be blamed.

# Chapter II.

## YAKKHAS, NĀGAS, AND OTHER NON-HUMAN BEINGS.

## Yakkhas and Nāgas and other Non-human Beings.

There are many references to the yakkhas in the Mhvs. The first account of them (I. 21) is found in the story of the Buddha's first visit to Ceylon.

The customary meeting place of the yakkhas was the Mahānāga garden on the river bank, and once when there was a great gathering the Buddha came and hovered over the place of the Mahiyaṅgaṇa thūpa. He struck terror in their hearts by rain, storm and darkness, and they begged him to release them from these terrors. He asked for a place to sit down and they even offered him the whole island. Then he seated caused the Giridīpa to come near to them and, when they had entered it, he made it return to its own place.

The Dpvs account differs in details. There were not only yakkhas but also bhūtas, pisācas, rakkhaṣas, and avaruddhakas. The Dpvs makes no reference to the Mahānāga garden but makes clear what the Giridīpa means. It is not the central part of Ceylon, but another island which is described in detail.

In the Mhvs V. 266 Asoka is said to have sent two yakkhas to assemble together all the bhikkhus on the earth in order to

decide the true doctrines.

The next reference to the yakkhas is in the story of Vijaya (Vll.9). When Vijaya landed in Ceylon with his followers, a yakkhiṇī, an attendant of Kuvaṇṇa, appeared in the form of a bitch. One of the men followed her thinking that dogs are found only where there is a village. He came to a pond and saw her mistress Kuvaṇṇa, who sat at the foot of a tree spinning like a woman hermit. After he bathed and drank, Kuvaṇṇa could not devour him because of the magic thread, which he refused to hand over. She then seized him and hurled him into a chasm. The rest of the seven hundred too came here and she treated them likewise.

Vijaya, when he was addressed as prince by her, knew her to be a yakkhiṇī. Then he drew his bow and caught her in the noose about the neck; and threatening to kill her with his sword, demanded the men. She in fright offered him the kingdom. Then she restored the men and showed rice and other food that had been in the ships of those traders whom she had devoured. She afterwards assumed the form of a sixteen year old maiden and Vijaya made her his wife.

At this time the daughter of the chief of the yakkhas was to be married at the city of the yakkhas called Sirīsavatthu,

and Kuvanna helped Vijaya to kill the yakkhas who were gathered together but were invisible.

Later, when Vijaya married a princess from Madhurā, Kuvanna is sent away with her two children. She is taken for a spy by the yakkhas and is killed. The children then fled to Sumanakūṭa, and the brother took the sister for wife and their descendants are the Pulindā of Malaya.

This story is not found in the Dpvs, and the lateness of it is also evident from the mention of Sumanakūṭa (Adam's Peak), which is nowhere mentioned in the Dpvs. Moreover this contradicts the story of the Buddha's visit, according to which all the yakkhas were expelled to Giridīpa.

The origin of this story which is like that of Circe, may be traced to the Valāhassa Jātaka (196) which deals with the story of the yakkhiṇīs who lived in Tambapaṇṇi. The references to the dog as a sign of the existence of a village, the devouring of human beings by yakkhiṇīs, rice and other food, ships of traders who were devoured, and Sirīsavatthu are all reminiscent of this Jātaka.

In the story of Paṇḍukābhaya it is said that the herdsman Citta and the slave Kāḷavela, the attendants of Gāmaṇi, were put to death and were reborn as yakkhas. They then kept guard over Paṇḍukābhaya while he was in his mother's womb.

When Paṇḍukābhaya was being taken to Dvāramaṇḍalaka and was in danger of being killed by his uncles, they caused a great boar to appear and thus saved him from death.

Paṇḍukābhaya also received assistance during his campaign from a yakkhiṇī named Cetiyā. She dwelt near the pond Tumbariyaṅgaṇa on the Dhūmarakkha mountain, and used to wander in the form of a mare with a white body and red feet. Paṇḍukābhaya took a noose and tried to capture her; but she fled without making herself invisible. She circled the pond seven times, plunged into the Mahāgaṅgā, came out of it, and ran again round the Dhūmarakkha mountain seven times. Then she circled the pond three times more and plunged again into the river near the Kacchaka ford. Here the prince seized her by the mane and also a palm-leaf which turned into a sword. He threatened to kill her, but she begged him to spare her, and offered to conquer the kingdom for him. He then went back to the Dhūmarakkha mountain riding on the mare. Later he followed her advice with regard to the war and rode on her when fighting.

After he occupied Anurādhapura he placed Kāḷavela on the east side of the city, and the yakkha Cittarāja at the lower end of the Abhaya tank. The slave-woman who had helped him and was reborn as a yakkhiṇī he settled at the south gate of the city. In the royal precincts he placed the yakkhiṇī in the form of a

mare. He had sacrificial offerings made to them and others annually. On festival days he sat with Cittarāja on a seat of equal height and had a play which incorporated celestial and human being. Paṇḍukābhaya, who had yakkhas and bhūtas for friends, enjoyed his good fortune with Kāḷavela and Cittarāja who were visible.

The story of Cetiyā is similar to that of Kuvaṇṇa in many respects. Both, like the yakkhas visited by the Buddha, lived near a pond. Both when threatened with death offered to secure a kingdom. In other details too there are many similarities. In the Rājāvaliya it is said that Kuvaṇṇa transformed herself into a mare and Vijaya rode on her when fighting the yakkhas.

In the Ghata Jātaka (454), which seems to be the basis of the story of Paṇḍukābhaya, it is a donkey that helps and not a mare According to the Uttaravihāraṭṭhakathā (M Ṭ p.202) Paṇḍukābhaya after capturing Cetiyā went first to her dwelling and lived with her for seven days. Afterwards he stood at the entrance of the cave called Cittapassa and caused her to see the people and made her gladden them before he returned to the camp.

The change was perhaps partly due to the influence of the Padakusalamāṇava Jātaka (432). According to it the queen of Brahmadatta, king of Benares, was born as a yakkhiṇī with a face like a horse. She dwelt in a rock cave in a vast forest at the foot of a mountain and used to catch and devour men who

went from the East to the Western border.

Other Jātakas too seem to have influenced the story of Paṇḍukābhaya. According to the Ayoghara Jātaka (510) a yakkha is said to fear a palm leaf. In the Sutana Jātaka (398) ~~there~~ there is an instance of a yakkha being settled at the city gate and offerings of rice being made to him. According to the Kurudhamma Jātaka (276) every third year, in the month of Kattika, the kings used to hold a festival called the Kattika feast. During it they used to deck themselves out in great magnificence and dress up like gods. They stood in the presence of a yakkha named Cittarāja, the king of many colours, and shot to the four points of the compass arrows wreathed in flowers and painted in divers colours. This king then, in keeping with the feast, stood on the bank of a lake in the presence of Cittarāja and shot arrows to the four quarters.

The Kattika festival is referred to in Jātakas 118, 147, and 527, and it seems to have some connection with sensual pleasures. It is significant that Cittarāja in the Mhvs is also connected with a lake.

In the account of the Buddhist Missions (XII.20), when the thera Majjhantika converted the nāga king and eighty-four

thousand nāgas it is said that many yakkhas, gandhabbas and kumbhaṇḍakas came into the refuges and the precepts of duty. But a yakkha named Paṇḍaka with the yakkhiṇī Hāritā his wife and his five hundred sons obtained the first fruit of sanctification

The Smp gives the yakkha as Pañcaka and does not give the name of the wife. The Dhvs makes no reference to these incidents.

In the Mhvs XlV.7. Devānaṃpiya Tissa when he is addressed by the name Tissa imagines Mahinda to be a yakkha as no one born in the island would have called him by name.

In Suvaṇṇabhūmi (xii.44) whenever a boy was born in the royal palace a rakkhasī used to devour it. When the theras Soṇa and Uttara went there a prince was born, and when the rakkhasī appeared with her retinue the thera Soṇa created twice as many rakkhasas and the rakkhasī frightened fled.

In the Smp the story of the rakkhasī is almost identical with that of the Mhvs but in the Dhvs the story is not given. It is only said that they conquered multitudes of pisācas, and that Majjhima with others converted the yakkhas of the Himavant.

There is a similar story in the Jātakas. According to the Ayoghara Jātaka(510) both the sons of the king of Benares were devoured by a yakkhiṇī as soon as they were born.

According to the Mhvs XXXVl.82 a yakkha known as Ratakkhi came

to Ceylon and made the eyes of people red. If the people saw one another or spoke of the redness of their eyes they died immediately and the yakkha devoured them. The king Sirisanghabodhi ~~The king~~ made the yakkha come to him by his merit and asked him not to devour his subjects. The yakkha wanted people of one region for food. The king refused to give up a single one except himself. The yakkha then prayed for an offering, and the king ordered offerings to be made everywhere in the island.

The nāgas ~~even~~ play even a greater part in the Mhvs tales. The first account of them is found in the narratives of the visits of the Buddha(I.44). In the fifth year of his Buddhahood the Master saw that a war was about to take place between the Nāgas Mahodara and Cūlodara, uncle and nephew, and their followers. Mahodara was a king in the nāga kingdom in the ocean that covered half a thousand yojanas. His younger sister had been married to the nāga king on the Kaṇṇāvaḍḍhamāna mountain, and their son was Cūlodara. His mother had inherited from her father a splendid throne of jewels. Now the uncle wanted to make war on the nephew for this gem-set throne. To prevent this fight Buddha visited Nāgadīpa.

The Buddha frightened them and they paid him reverence. He then preached the doctrine that begets concord and they gave

up the throne to him. The Buddha came down and seated on the throne refreshed himself with celestial food and drink provided by the nāga kings. After that he established in the refuges and in the moral precepts eighty koṭis of snake spirits on land and sea. He also planted there the rājāyatana tree as a memorial and gave it and the throne to the nāga kings to pay homage to them.

During this visit the nāga king Maṇiakkhika of Kalyāṇi, Mahodara's maternal uncle, invited the Buddha to visit his dwelling-country, and three years after the Buddha visited Kalyāṇi. He sat upon a precious throne seat under a canopy decked with gems raised upon a spot where afterwards the Kalyāṇi cetiya was built, and the nāga king served him with celestial food.

The Dhvs is not in full agreement with the Mhvs with regard to these visits. The Mhvs says that the Buddha came to Nāgadīpa but does not refer to Laṅkā or Tambapaṇṇī. The Dhvs mentions these names but does not refer to Nāgadīpa. ~~Further it says that the throne-seat was placed between the two islands(dīpa). Verses 8-12~~ chapter II lines 15-24, which are in a different metre, give more details which are not found in the Mhvs.

The story of this conflict between the two Nāga kings is not peculiar to the Ceylon chronicles. The Tamil poem Maṇimekalai deals with it, but the details again vary. The battle takes place in the sea-girt land of Maṇipallavam and the kings come from the southern regions(Ancient Jaffna p.8).

There are references to the nāgas also in the legends about Asoka. At his consecration (V. 28) the nāgas brought out of the nāga kingdom stuff coloured like the jasmine blossom and without a seam, celestial lotus-flowers, collyrium and unguents. The Dpvs VI. 8 adds fragrant powder for washing the head.

In the Mhvs V.87 Asoka is said to have sent for Mahākāla of wondrous might, who had beheld four Buddhas and had lived through a kappa, and had him brought fettered with a chain of gold. Asoka made him sit on a throne under a white canpoy, paid homage to him with various flowers, and bade sixteen thousand women to surround him. Asoka then bade him make an image of the Buddha and the Nāga king created a beauteous figure of the Buddha endowed with the thirty-two greater signs and brilliant with the eighty lesser signs surrounded by fathom-long rays of glory and adorned with a crown of flames.

The Smp gives the same account with a little more descriptive detail. The Dpvs (VI.13) has only one couplet about him, and makes no reference to the crration of an image.

In the Divyāvadāna, p.392, in the account of Asoka's pilgrimage, it is said that Asoka visited the spot where the Nāgarāja Kālika had praised the Buddha. There the Nāga showed himself to the king and answered his query.

as to the appearance of the Buddha.

This account seems to be closer to the account in the Dpvs, while the story in the Smp and the Mhvs appears to be a more developed form of it.

In the account of the conversion of the different countries (XII.9) it is said that at that time in Kasmīra and Gandhāra the nāga king called Aravāḷa caused a hail-storm to fall upon the ripe crops and cruelly overwhelmed everything with a flood. The thera Majjhantika went there and performed miracles such as walking on the surface of the water of Aravāḷa's lake. The nāgas informed their king about it, and the nāga king, full of fury, brought divers terrors to pass. The thera by his wondrous power brought all these terrors to naught and preached to the humbled nāga king, who with eighty-four thousand nāgas, gandhabbas, yakkhas, and kumbhaṇḍakas were converted. Then the lord of the nāgas made the thera sit upon a jewel throne and stood near fanning him.

The Smp relates the same story; but the Dpvs merely says that the thera appeased an enraged nāga and released many people from the fetters.

According to the Aśokāvadāna (L.E.A.p.340) Madhyāntika went to the kingdom of Kashmir, where a great nāga lived. He sat down there, crossing his legs, and, thinking that he would not be

able to subdue the nāga unless he provoked its anger, he entered into ecstasy and made Kashmir tremble. The nāga in anger caused lightning and thunder, and produced a hail-storm. Madhyāntika then entered into samādhi and prevented even his garments from being spoilt. He changed lightning and thunder into a great shower of lotuses. The nāga then caused a shower of weapons and these the Thera changed into the seven kinds of jewels. The nāga then caused great trees and rocks to fall, and the Thera changed them into food and clothing. Next the nāga caused a heavy downpour of rain for seven days and seven nights, and the Thera caused the water to go to the ocean. Next the nāga tried to burn the Thera by sending out fire from his mouth, but the Thera transformed the fire into pearls. At last the nāga by his magic power made several thousands of nāgas appear and these the Thera changed into garuḍas. Then the nāga, frightened, asked Madhyāntika what he should do, and he was advised to take refuge in the three gems. The nāga next asked what Madhyāntika wished to do, and Madhyāntika asked for the place

where he was. The nāga refused at first; but when he heard of the prediction of the Buddha, he inquired how much land the Thera needed. Madhyāntika asked for enough land to sit, and sat cross-legged, filling the kingdom of Kashmir with his body. The nāga then asked why he needed so much land, and the Thera said he had as companions five hundred arahants. The nāga then gave him the land, and Madhyāntika led a large number of men into Kashmir and founded towns and villages.

This account is somewhat similar to the story about the nāga king Apalāḷa, whom, according to the Vinaya of the Mūla-Sarvastivādins, the Buddha himself converted when he visited Kashmir in the company of the yakṣa Vajrapāṇi (Journal Asiatique 1914, Tome IV p. 510).

When the Bodhi-tree (XIX. 19) was being brought to Ceylon it is said that the nāgas practised magic to get the Bodhi-tree, but the therī Saṃghamittā took the form of a supaṇṇa and terrified them. Then they, with the permission of the therī, took the tree to the realm of the nāgas, and, after worshipping it for a week and offering it the kingship of the nāgas and other manifold things, they brought it back.

The account in the Smp is the same but that in the Dhvs is more elaborate and detailed. There is, however, no reference to the attempt to take it away or to their offering it the kingship of nāgas. On the other hand the Dhvs mentions the flowers that were offered. It also adds that the floor of the nāga world is covered with gems, pearls and crystals, and in it there were also gardens and tanks with various flowers.

In the account of the building of the Mahāthūpa(XXXI.17) it is said that the thūpa in Rāmagāma was destroyed by the overflowing of the Ganges, but the urn with the relics reached the ocean and stayed there in the two-fold divided waters on a throne of many coloured gems surrounded by rays of light. The nāgas seeing it went to the nāga palace Mañjerika and informed the king Kālanāga. He thereupon brought the relics to his palace and built over them a thūpa made of all kinds of jewels.

Soṇuttara being asked to bring these relics plunged into the earth and soon appeared before the nāga king. The king unwilling to give the relics made a sign to his nephew Vāsuladatta, who went and swallowed the urn. Then he went to the foot of Mount Sineru and lay there coiled in a circle. Three hundred yojanas long was the ring and one yojana was his measure around. Next he created many thousand hoods and belched

~~Next he created many thousand hoods and belched~~ forth smoke and fire. Then he created many thousands like himself and made them lie about in a circle.

The nāga king tried to satisfy the thera but the latter continued to press for the relics. At last the nāga king asked the thera to take them away thinking that they were quite safe with his nephew. The thera immediately created a slender arm, and stretching the hand straightway down the throat of the nephew of the nāga king took the urn with the relics. Then he plunged into the earth and rose up in his cell. When the nāgas realised that the urn was lost, they lamented and came to the bhikkhus who gave them a few relics.

In the Pāli Dictionary by Rhys Davids and Stede the meaning of the word yakkha is discussed at length. According to Pāli Commentators a yakkha is ~~one~~ a non-human being to whom a sacrifice of expiation or propitiation is given. ~~They are non-human and in many respects resemble the Vedic pisācas.~~ Usually they are kind to human beings and act as tutelary deities, but some of them are referred to as cruel and dangerous. They are generally associated with the sea or silent lakes.

Professor Vogel deals exhaustively with the nāgas in his work on Indian Serpent Lore. The world of nāgas according

to Hindu ideas lay far beneath the human world, and was the lowest of the seven nether regions. It was not a place of darkness or of terror, but an abode of delight and a place of fabulous wealth. It could be reached through peaks of mountains, caves and water-holes. Nāgas are sometimes divided into those who dwell on the ocean and those who dwell on the mountains. They like the yakkhas are commonly believed to inhabit lakes, pools, rivers and springs, and sometimes certain islands are referred to as their dwelling places. They are always associated with jewels and precious things, and often gem-set thrones are mentioned in connection with them.

The yakkhas and nāgas are often referred to along with devas, devatās, supaṇṇas, ghandabbas, rakkhasas, pisācas, and kumbhaṇḍas. The devas are not human beings but beneficial deities, and like other spirits might have been human beings in a previous existence. The bhummadevas lived on the earth, and others in the upper worlds. Devatās are spirits who are associated with trees, water and mountains. Sometimes the word deva is also used instead of devatā. The ghandabbas are a kind of demi-gods who inhabit the Cātumahārājika world. Two of them mentioned in the Mhvs are Pañcasikha and Timbaru. The Supaṇṇas like the garuḷas are winged creatures and ~~seem to have been~~ were feared by the nāgas. Kumbhaṇḍas, pisācas, rakkhasas, bhūtas, and

asuras are other non-human beings classed with the yakkhas and nāgas.

The upper worlds are Cātumahārājika, Tāvatiṃsa, Yāma, Tusita Nimmānarati, Paranimmitavasavattī, and Brahma; and the chiefs of these are the Mahārājas, Sakka, Suyāma, Santusita, Sunimmita, Vasavattī and Mahābrahma respectively.

The four mahārājas or lokapālas are Dhataraṭṭha, the lord of the gandhabbas, who was the ruler of the East. Virūlha, the king of the kumbhaṇḍas, who ruled the South. Virūpakkha, the king of the nāgas, who ruled the West, and Kuvera or Vessavana, the king of the yakkhas, who ruled the North. Therefore according to Buddhist ideas yakkhas, nāgas, gandhabbas and kumbhaṇḍas belonged to the first of the upper worlds.

Sakka is also called Purindada, Maghavā, Vāsava, Sahasakko, Sujampati, and Kosiya. Uppalavaṇṇa ~~according to Prof. Geiger~~ is a name for Viṣṇu.

In early Buddhist literature yakkhas and nāgas do not seem to have ever meant human beings. They seem to have possessed some human qualities and could be converted by the Buddha, but they are always considered as non-human beings (amānussa) quite distinct from men (mānussa). There seems to be also no support for the theory that they were aborigines who were

worshippers of spirits or serpents.

Professor Vogel refers to the views of James Fergusson who thought the Nāgas were an aboriginal race of Turanian stock, inhabiting northern India that worshipped serpents, C.F.Oldham who considered them to be totemistic peoples, and Oldenberg who believed them to be demoniacal beings were like wolves who often appeared in human shape.After dealing with all these three views he says: "The Nāgas may occasionally assume human form,but they do not belong to the human world.Theirs is the Nāgaloka wherever that mysterious realm of snakes may be located.They are decidedly unhuman (a-mānushā), and in Buddhist writings they are frankly classed as animals."

# Chapter III.

## THE VISITS OF THE BUDDHA.

## The Buddha and His Visits to Ceylon.

The first chapter of the Mhvs from the fifth verse ~~five~~ is devoted to a short sketch of the life of the Buddha and to an account of his visits to Ceylon. His meetings with the previous Buddhas are fully dealt with in the Buddhavaṃsa. This work obviously is not an historical account. It is undoubtedly a late work and its beginnings are to be seen in the Mahāpadāna Suttanta of the Dīgha Nikāya, where there is an account of the six buddhas previous to Gotama Buddha. The Mhvs probably leaves out, the first three Buddhas because Gotama had no connection with them.

Some of the details, ~~however,~~ connected with the visits, however, do not agree with the Buddhavaṃsa Commentary. It is possible that the author of the Mhvs is indebted for his list to the Nidāna-kathā or even to the Aṭṭhakathā itself, which, according to Jātaka, Vol. I. p.44, gives a similar list. The Dpvs makes no reference to the homage paid by Gotama to the previous Buddhas, though it has been very much influenced by the Bu and refers in other places to the three Buddhas, Kakusandha, Koṇāgamana and Kassapa. It deals with the same period of the life of Gotama Buddha as the Mhvs, but gives more details in some things and less in others. Neither Uruvelā in Magadha, as the place of enlightenment,

nor the number of the Bhaddavaggiyas is mentioned. There is also no indication of the dates of his enlightenment or of his visits to Laṅkā. On the other hand it mentions the defeat of Māra, the names of the seven places ~~that~~ where he spent the seven weeks, the conversion of the eighty koṭis of beings at Bārānasī, the conversion of Kondaññā, Bhaddiya, Vappa, Mahānāma and Assaji on his preaching the Anattalakkhaṇa discourse, the name of his residence at Bārānasī Isipatana, the four friends of Yasa and the fifty youths, the name of the grove of the Bhaddavaggiyas Kappāsika, and the fact that the Aṅgas and the Magadhas were those who prepared the sacrifice.

The Dpvs also says that when the Buddha surveyed the world after his enlightenment he saw the beautiful island of Laṅkā as a fit place for noble persons and thought that the yakkhas, bhūtas, and the rakkhases should be expelled and Laṅkā should be inhabited by men. Then follows a prediction about the Councils, Asoka, and Mahinda. The account of this prediction is unsatisfactory, and is perhaps a later interpolation.

The Mhvs makes no reference to this, ~~but~~ and only says that the Buddha knew that in Laṅkā his doctrine would shine in glory and that the Yakkhas had to be driven forth.

The Mahāvagga (I. v.12) ~~cannot~~ also refers to ~~this~~ a survey made by the Buddha, but ~~as~~ it took place soon after his enlightenment and not four weeks later.

The Dpvs account is clearly not a continuous one, and does not refer to all the incidents recorded in the Mahāvagga, though some parts of it show the influence of the language of this work. There are also facts not recorded in the Mahāvagga such as the defeat of Māra, the seven places visited after the enlightenment, the number of the beings converted at Bārāṇasī, and the name of the grove of the Bhaddavaggiyas.

As it is pointed out elsewhere, all these facts not mentioned in the Mahāvagga appear to be interpolations or are ~~found~~ couched in a ~~style~~ quite different style. It is not possible to say which of these parts are older, as the Dpvs originally seems to have been a number of independent ballads and memori~~ter~~al verses.

The defeat of Māra, the seven places visited after the enlightenment, and the name of the grove of the Bhaddavaggiyas are mentioned in the Jātaka Nidānakathā. The number of beings converted at Bārāṇasī is borrowed obviously from the Bu.

Dr. E.J.Thomas in "The Life of Buddha as Legend and History" deals with the records about the life of the Buddha. Whatever value one may attach to the Mahāvagga as an historical

document, there can be no doubt with regard to the visits to Ceylon. In the Pāli Canon there is no record of them ~~in the Pāli Canon~~ or even of the predictions about the Councils, Asoka, Vijaya and Mahinda. Even the name Tambapaṇṇi accurs only in the Mahāniddesa Vol.I. 155 and in the Valāhassa Jātaka (196).

The account of these visits to Ceylon formed a part of the Porānā which dealt with the visits of the Buddha and the coming of the relics, the Bodhi-tree, the teaching of the collections and of the teachers, the sāsana, and the chief men.

Stories of such visits are not peculiar to Ceylon. There are similar tales connected with Mathurā and Kashmir. At Kashmir he subdues a nāga and predicts the apostleship of Madhyāntika and the building of thūpas (Journal Asiatique, 1914. Vol.II. pp.495 - 522 and 538 - 540).

There is not sufficient evidence to decide whether the stories of the expulsion of the yakkhas and the pacifying of the nāgas arose in Ceylon or were borrowed from elsewhere and adapted to suit Ceylon. In the Maṇimekalai the island referred to in the conflict of the nāga kings is Maṇipallavam and not Ceylon. The prefix maṇi is common in nāga names. In Buddhist accounts there are the names Maṇikaṇṭha, Maṇichūda and Maṇibhadraka,

and Maṇipallavam seems to be quite a suitable name for an island of the nāgas. Fa-hsien refers to an island near Ceylon where maṇi beads (fine pearls), used for rosaries, are found. ~~According to the Dpvs the nāgas placed the throne between the dīpa and not in Ceylon.~~

In Buddhist literature there does not seem to have existed a definite idea as to Nāgadīpa; according to Sussondi Jātaka (360) when King Tamba was reigning in Benares and the Bodhisat was born as a Garuḍa, Nāgadīpa was Serumadīpa. In Akitti Jātaka (480), when the Bodhisat was born as Akitti, he went from Benares to Kavirapaṭṭana and then by air to Kāradīpa, which was in the neighbourhood of Nāgadīpa; but at that time Kāradīpa was Ahidīpa (the island of the snakes). In both these accounts there is a reference to a tree, in the Sussondi Jātaka to a Nigrodha tree and in the Akitta Jātaka to a kāra tree. These perhaps explain the reference in the Mhvs to the rājāyatana tree, which is also called khīrapala or tārāyana. Perhaps the story as found in Maṇimekalai is an older form and was later adapted to suit Ceylon.

In the Valāhassa Jātaka (196) Tambapaṇṇidīpa is mentioned, and the yakkhiṇis who lived there are said to have wandered along the sea-shore from Nāgadīpa to Kalyāṇi. The first

visit of the Buddha was to expel the yakkhas. The second visit was to Nāgadīpa and the third to Kalyāṇi. Since Kalyāṇi and Nāgadīpa were definite places in Ceylon, it is possible that this Jātaka helped the development of the legends, which are similar to those of Kashmir.

The accounts of the visits are valuable from an historical point of view on account of the names of places mentioned. In the account of the first visit the Mhvs mentions the Mahānāga garden and the Mahiyaṅgaṇa thūpa. This Mahānāga garden must have been near Mahiyaṅgaṇa, but it is no more referred to in the Mhvs, and the Dpvs makes no mention of it at all. The Dpvs, however, refers to the Mahiyaṅgana thūpa, but it seems to occur in an interpolated ~~line~~ passage, and perhaps there was no reference to a particular place in the original account.

The Mhvs adds further information about the Mahiyaṅgaṇathūpa but the part played by the deva Mahāsumana of Sumanakūṭa and the thera Sarabhu cannot be historical.

In Mhvs XX.25 Jambukolavihāra is said to have been in Nāgadīpa, and since the yakkhiṇīs in the Jātaka are said to have wandered from Nāgadīpa to Kalyāṇi, Nagadīpa probably formed the Northern or the North-west part of Ceylon.

In the account of the third visit in the Mhvs Sumanakūṭa, Dīghavāpi

cetiya, the Mahāmeghavanārāma, the place of the Bodhi-tree, the Mahāthūpa, the thūpa of the Thūpārāma, the Silācetiya, and the Kalyāṇi cetiya are mentioned. In the Dpvs it is not clear whether the places mentioned are later additions as this part seems to be a mere compilation, but there is no mention of Sumanakūṭa, the Thūpārāma cetiya and the Silācetiya. There is a reference to a Mahāthūpa before the Buddha leaves Kalyāṇi, and it is not clear whether this Thūpa refers to the Kalyāṇi cetiya, the Thūpārāma cetiya, or the Mahāthūpa built by Duṭṭhagāmaṇī. The Smp mentions the Thūpārāma cetiya and the Kalyāṇi cetiya besides the Mahāthūpa, but makes no reference to Sumanakūṭa and the Silācetiya. It is strange, however, that the Smp adds further Mutiyaṅgaṇacetiya, which is not referred to in the Mhvs and was situated in Badulla. The Burmese Mss. of the British Museum Orient 3570 and 1027 also add Mahiyaṅgaṇacetiya. For Mutiyangaṇa there are also the readings Mutuṅgaṇa and Mudungaṇa. These two names of cetiyas may be later additions.

It is striking that neither the Dpvs nor the Smp refers to Sumanakūṭa. It has been suggested (Ceylon Journal of Science Vol.II. Part I.p.64) that Sumana or Saman is the same as Samantabhadra, one of the eight principal Bodhisattvas of the Mahāyānists. If this is so, the worship of the supposed footprint of the Buddha on Adam's Peak

## Chapter IV.

## THE GENEALOGY OF THE BUDDHA.

## The Genealogy of the Buddha.

The genealogy of the Buddha is given in chapter II of the Mhvs; and though this account is less complete than the one in the Dpvs there is hardly any disagreement. In the passages dealing with the first twenty-eight kings the only discrepancies are in the names Angīrasa and Surucī, for which the Dpvs has Angīsa and Mahāruci; but these are not contradictions. After this the Mhvs gives only a list of the numbers of the princes who ruled till Makhādeva, while the Dpvs gives the name of the last king of each line and the town where each dynasty reigned. The Dpvs also gives the names of the two sons of Kaḷārajanaka, and the names of the sixteen kings who ruled after Vijaya, the last of this dynasty. There is, however, no mention in the Dpvs of Yasodharā, the daughter of Jayasena and wife of Añjana, Devadahasakka and his children Añjana and Kaccāna, the wife of Sīhahanu; Daṇḍapāni and Sākiya Suppabuddha, the sons, and Māyā and Pajāpatī, the daughters of Añjana and the wives of Suddhodana; Amitā, the wife of Suppabuddha, and Pamitā, the daughters of Sīhahanu; Devadatta and Bhaddakaccāna, the wife of prince Siddhattha, who were the children of Sakka Suppabuddha.

The names of the kings omitted in the Mhvs are given in M Ṭ (p.80) which gets them from the Sīhalaṭṭhakathā; but there are, however, a few differences. For Kambalavasabha, Purindada,

Siṭṭhi, Bhaddadeva, Buddhadatta and Dīpaṃkara, the MṬ gives Kambalavasana, Munindadeva, Sippi, Hatthideva, Samuddadatta and Dīvaṅkara respectively. The town of the Accima dynasty according to the MṬ is Kusāvatī, but none of the readings of the Dpvs, Pakula, Kapila, Bakula, Sakula, Pagula and Sāgala, agree with it, while for Vajīra, Kaṇṇagoccha Rojāna and Malitthiya the MṬ gives Vajīravutti, Kannagotta, Romanāma and Tāmalitti. For the later kings Navaratha, Bilāratha, Cittadassi, and Atthadassi the MṬ has Bharatha, Vilāratha, Cittaraṃsi and Ambaraṃsi. Perhaps Siṭṭhi or Sippi of Ariṭṭhapura may be the same as King Sivi of Ariṭṭhapura of the Jātakas, as the father of Sañjaya was another King Sivi. The Viṣṇu Purāna IV. 12, like the Dpvs, gives Navaratha as the father of Daśaratha. The Mhvs of the Uttaravihāra (MṬ p.86) adds that the youngest of the line of Sīhassara was Bhagusakka, his descendants were eighty-two thousand, and the youngest was Jayasena.

With reference to the immediate predecessors of the Buddha who are referred to more fully in the Mhvs, the MṬ says that the meaning should be well understood after examining this well in the manner of the Aṭṭhakathā and making it free from confusion. From this statement one may infer that the information given in the Mhvs was in the Aṭṭhakathā and that it was there more clearly or fully expressed.

Parts of this genealogy can be traced to the Pāli Canon itself. In the Aggañña Suttanta (D.III. p.93) the Buddha deals with the first beings and relates the story of Mahāsammata who became the first king. In the Ambaṭṭha Suttanta (D.I.p.92) the Buddha, explaining the origin of the Sākiyas, says that King Okkāka, in order to confer the sovereignty on the son of his favourite queen, banished his elder children Okkāmukha, Karaṇḍu, Hatthinīya and Sīnipura.

In the Makhādevasutta (M.II.p.78) it is said that King Makhādeva of Mithilā had eighty four thousand descendants and that Nimi was the last of the line and that Nimi's son was Kalārajanaka.

In the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta (D.II.p. 146) the Buddha is made to say that Kusinārā was once the royal city of Mahāsudassana under the name of Kusāvati. This account is further developed in the Mahāsudassana Suttanta (D.II.p.169).

According to Bu the Buddha says that in the time of the Buddha Sujāta he was the universal ruler Antalikkhacara (XIII.11), at the time of the Buddha Sikhi he was the king Arindama (XXI. 9), in the time of the Buddha Vessabhū he was the king Sudessana (XXII.11) and in the time of the Buddha Tissa he was king Sujāta (XVIII. 9)

In Cp.I.IV.1. King Mahāsudassana of Kusāvatī is mentioned, in I.VI. 1. Nimi of Mithilā, in I.VIII.1. Sivi of the city of Ariṭṭha, in I.VII.1 a prince Canda, in I.IX.11. King Vessantara, and in I.IX.29 his son Jāli, and in I.X.20 - 21 the Buddha says that Mahāsudassana, Nimi, Canda and Sivi were himself.

This genealogy can even more directly be traced to the Jātakas. The Mandhātu Jātaka (258) gives all the names of the earliest kings. It is said there that in the early ages of the world there lived a king named Mahāsammata and his descendants were Roja, Vararoja, Kalyāṇa, Varakalyāṇa, Uposatha and Mandhāta. The Cetiya Jātaka (422) also gives these names but adds to the line Varamandhāta, Cara and Upacara (also called Apacara). It also points out that Mahāsammata lived in the first age for an asaṅkheyya and reigned over the kingdom of Ceti in Sotthivatī.

In the Nimi Jātaka(541) the gātha 99 gives a list of kings, two of whose names occur in the genealogy of the Buddha:

Dudīpa, Sāgara, Sela, Mucalinda, Bhagīrasa,
Usīnara, Aṭṭhaka, Assaka, Putthujjana.

In another gātha in the same Jātaka there are the names Bharatha and Angīrasa.

The Ghata Jātaka(454) refers to two kings by the name of Sāgara and a king of the same name is also mentioned in the

Bhūridatta Jātaka (543). In the Āditta Jātaka it is said that a king named Bharata reigned at Roruva in the kingdom of Sovīra, and at the end the Buddha says he himself was King Bharata. An Angīrasa is mentioned in the Sarabhaṅga Jātaka (522). According to the Surūcī Jātaka (489) a king called Surūci reigned in Mithilā, and his son was also called Surūcī. In the same Jātaka King Surūcī is also referred to as Ruci and it is also mentioned that his son was Mahāpanāda. The same parentage is also given in the Mahāpanāda Jātaka (264). In the Culladhammapāla Jātaka (358) the Bodhisat is said to have been born as the son of Mahāpatāpa, king of Benares. A king Sudassana who ruled at Kusāvatī is mentioned in the Mahāsudassana Jātaka (95) where the Buddha says he himself was Mahāsudassana. The Bhūridatta Jātaka (543) mentions another Sudassana, who was the son of King Dhataraṭṭha. According to the Sonaka Jātaka (529) the Bodhisat was born as the son of the Magadha king who ruled at Rājagaha and was given the name of Arindama. King Brahmadatta of Benares is mentioned in the Sarabha-Miga Jātaka (483) and in the Bhūridatta Jātaka (543), and a Brahmadatta, king of Kampilla, is referred to in the Mahāummaga Jātaka (546). According to the Sādhina Jātaka (494) the Buddha was born as King Sādhina of Mithilā, and according to the Makhādeva Jātaka (9)

was also once Makhādeva. In the Nimi Jātaka (541) there are more details about Makhādeva. He ruled over Videha and lived in Mithilā. Eighty-three thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight princes of his family renounced the world. Then he himself was born as Nimi and his son was Kaḷārajanaka. According to the Samanassa Jātaka (505) a king called Reṇu ruled over Kuru from the city of Uttarapañcāla, and in the Kusa Jātaka (531) the Bodhisat is said to have been born as the son of King Okkāka and was called Kusa. The Dasaratha Jātaka (461) says that Dasaratha was king of Benares, and Rāma was one of his sons. He was succeeded by Bharatha, and the Buddha says he himself was Rāma. King Okkāka is also mentioned in the Jambu Khādaka Jātaka (294). A king Sivi is mentioned in the Indriya Jātaka (423). In the Sivi Jātaka (499) and in the Ummadantī Jātaka (527) it is said that the Bodhisat was born as the son of King Siri of Ariṭṭhapura and was also given the name of Sivi. According to the Vessantara Jātaka King Sivi of Jetuttara had a son called Sañjaya. His son was Vessantara and his son was Jāli.

There seems to have been a definite tradition about the earliest kings. The list from Mahāsammata to Mandhāta is found not only ~~found~~ in two Jātakas and DAI p.258 but also in the Mahāvastu (I.348) which belongs to the Vinaya of the Mahāsaṃghikas of the Lokottaravāda School and in the Dulva, the Tibetan translation of

the Vinaya of the Sarvāstivādins. The Mahāvastu, however, omits Roja and Vararoja while the Dulva does not give the name Vararoja. Cara and Upacara are included both in the Cetiya Jātaka (422) and in the Dulva. Varamandhāta, though given in the Cetiya Jātaka, is not found in the Dpvs, the Mhvs, the Mahāvastu or the Dulva. The next king Cetiya given in the Dpvs is not found in any of the other lists, and it is significant that in the Aṭṭhakathā of the Uttaravihāra there was also no mention of Cetiya (M Ṭ p.80) and the dynasty therefore, consisted of twenty-seven kings. It is possible that by some error the name of the Jātaka crept into the lists of the Dpvs and the Mhvs.

After Upacara the Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī gives Makhādeva while the Mahāvastu says there were many thousands of kings after Mandhāta and proceeds to deal with the family of Ikṣvāku. Rockhill (The Life of the Buddha p.9) gives the names Kārumant and Upsakārumant, but unfortunately does not give the kings between Upakārumant and Maheśvarasena, the great-grandfather of Ikṣvāku, though they were given in the Dulva. He mentions, however, some of the places in which they ruled as Varaṇasi, Kampala (Kapila?) Hastipura, Takshaśilā and Kanyakubja. According to the Dpvs Ajitajana or Abhitatta ruled in Bāraṇasi, Brahmadatta at Kapila, Kambalavasabha at Hatthipura, Tālissara at Takkasilā and Naradeva at Kaṇṇagoccha. Therefore it is possible that the Dulva did not differ much from the Dpvs.

Many of the kings between Upacara and Okkāka, as already pointed out, can be traced to the Pāli Canon and the Jātakas.

It is likely that these names were later filled in from these and other sources. The addition of names from the Jātakas seems to have been made even after Okkāka for Sivi Sañjaya, Vessantara and Jāli are certainly borrowed from them.

There is no agreement withr egard to the descendants of Okkāka. According to the Mahāvastu they were Opura, his son, Nipura, his son Karakaṇḍa, his son Ulkhāmukha, his son Hastikasiśra, and his son Siṃhahanuḥ. The Mahāvastu thus does not make Ulkhāmukha the eldest but Opura, whose name does not occur in the other sources. It is also strange that in the Mahāvastu the descendants of Okkāka should bear the same names as those of his sons. The Dpvs and the Mhvs give as descendants Okkāmukha, Nipuṇa, Candima, Candamukha, Sivi, Sañjaya, Vessantara, Jāli, Sīhavāhana and Sīhassara with his eighty-two thousand descendants, the youngest of whom was Jayasena, and Jayasena's son was Sīhahanu.

Another difference is that in the Dulva and the Mahāvastu Ikṣvāku is given instead of Okkāka.It is possible that Okkāmukha is another form of Ulkhāmukha but it is difficult to explain how Ikṣvāku can change into Okkāka or vice versa.

According to the Dpvs, the Mhvs, the Mahāvastu and the Dulva, Sīhahanu was the grandfather of the Buddha, Suddhodana was his father and Dhotodana, Sukkodana and Amitodana were the

brothers of his father, but when it comes to the parents of his mother, there is again disagreement. According to the Mhvs Māyā's father was Añjana and her mother was Yasodharā, the sister of Sīhahanu, but in the Mahāvastu Māyā's father was Subhūti and according to the Dulva Suprabuddha who according to the Mhvs is her brother.

There is some support in the Pāli Canon for making the Buddha a Kosala, for in the Dhammacetiya Sutta (M.II.p.124) Pasenādi says that he, like the Buddha, was a Kosala. However, it is only a late tradition that makes him a descendant of Mahāsammata. It is difficult to say when the tradition came into existence. Prof. Winternitz (Geschichte der Indischen Litteratur II. 193) thinks that the kernel of the Mahāvastu may have originated as far back as the second century B.C. but some parts of the present text may even be later than the fourth century A.D. The present Dpvs text belongs to the same period, but there is no evidence to show when the account of the genealogy in it was constructed. It shows strong influence of the Bu and the Cp, the last book of the Khuddaka Nikāya. Prof. Winternitz (Ibid.p.133) says the Cp is much later than the other works of the Pāli Canon, but at present there is no evidence for a definite conclusion about its date. Among the contents of the Porānā of the Sīhala Aṭṭhakathā there is no reference to the

genealogy of the Buddha, and, since the account of the visits of the Buddha cannot be earlier than the first century B.C., ~~one~~ it perhaps will not be far wrong ~~if it is said~~ to say that it cannot be earlier than the first century A.D.

The Dpvs is undoubtedly later than the genealogical portions of the Purāṇas but it is difficult to say whether the account of the genealogy is younger or has been influenced by them. Some of the names of the kings such as Nimi, Mandhātr, Sāgara, Navaratha, Dasaratha and Rāma can be traced to them, but since these names also occur in the Buddhist Canon or in the Jātakas it is more likely that the author of the genealogy is indebted to the Buddhist sources for his information rather than to the Purāṇas.

Dr. E.J.Thomas in his Life of Buddha deals with the ancestry of the Buddha. "The contradictions," he says, "between the various versions as well as the borrowing of names and pedigrees exclude any probability that we have a basis of history in the Sakya genealogy. The basis is the historical fact of the existence of the Sakyas and Koliyas, on which an imaginative structure of legend has been built." (p.12) Again he adds: "Throughout the commentaries and Sanskrit works the legend prevails that Buddha was the son of a king, the descendant

of a long line of ancestors, and that he would have become a universal king, had he not renounced the world" (p.20). Then he goes on to point out that occasional phrases inherited from earlier traditions show that the Śākiyas were a local tribe who had, perhaps, a form of aristocratic rule but not kings.

# Chapter V.

## ASOKA.

## Asoka.

The story of Asoka and those connected with him is related in Mhvs chapters V, XI and XII. The part he played in the sending of the Bo-tree to Ceylon will be dealt with later.

The account of Asoka in the Smp is more detailed than that in the Mhvs, but in all important matters it agrees with it, though the order of the incidents differs greatly ~~differs~~. The Smp, however, does not give the previous histories of Dāsaka, Soṇaka and Caṇḍavajji, and makes no reference to the Thera Sumitta, the brother of Kontiputta Tissa (V.212). It does not give details about the messengers sent by Devānaṃpiya Tissa or about the route taken by them (XI.20). It does not mention also the date of the first consecration of Devānaṃpiya Tissa (XI.40). In the account of the things brought at the coronation of Asoka (v.24) the Smp has devatā where the Mhvs has deva, but it does not say who brought garments and other things from the Chaddanta lake. The Mhvs supplies this omission by adding the word marū, though the Dpvs says they were brought by the devatā.

The accounts of the journey of Mahinda and his companions to Ceylon in the Mhvs (ch.XIII.) and in the Smp are very similar and in the same order. But according to the Smp Bhaṇḍuka comes from Asokārāma and does not join at Vedisa, and it also does not refer to the relationship of Bhaṇḍuka to Devī or to the birth of Saṃghamittā.

The Smp also gives information not found in the Mhvs, for the Mhvs does not mention that Asoka had a dream before the arrival of Moggaliputta Tissa or that the sword-bearers tried to kill Moggaliputta Tissa for touching the king's hand.

The Dpvs account of these events is by no means a continuous one and has repetitions and interpolations. In the information that is given it usually keeps to the order of the subjects in the Smp; but the differences in subject matter are much greater than those between the Smp and the Mhvs. It has no reference at all to Asoka's brother Tissa, and says that Asoka killed all his hundred brothers. In one account of the Third Council there is no mention of the bhikkhus being killed by the minister of Asoka, and in the other the two couplets dealing with this incident seem to be an interpolation. The Dpvs also omits ~~does not~~ give ~~also~~ the previous history of Nigrodha and makes no reference to Indagutta, to Aggibrahmā, to the retirement of Moggaliputta Tissa to Ahogaṅga Mountain, or to the statement ~~fact~~ that Asoka was once called Caṇḍāsoka.

The Dpvs account of the journey of Mahinda is in the same order as in the Smp except for the story of Asoka's union with Devī and the birth of Mahinda, which are mentioned in chap.VI. The Dpvs also does not refer to the birth of Saṃghamittā or to the relationship between Bhaṇḍuka and Devī; but like the Smp it gives the age of Mahinda at Asoka's coronation, a detail omitted in Mhvs ch.XIII,

and a genealogical list before dealing with the reign of Devānampiya Tissa. The lines about the messengers sent by Devānampiya Tissa are clearly an interpolation in the Dpvs, and there is also no mention in it of the route taken by these envoys.

There is one more point which is significant. In the accounts of the Missions in the Dpvs, the Smp and the Mhvs it is quite clear that only five came to Ceylon though the Mhvs and the Smp say later on that seven came. Line twenty-seven of ch.XII of the Dpvs seems to confirm the fact that only five came, and line twenty-six seems to be an interpolation ~~and line fifty-five seems to suggest that only Sumana was added to the list at first and that Bhaṇḍuka was added still later~~. The relationship of Sumana to Saṃghamittā is also different according to the Dpvs. In ch.XV. line 186 Sumana is said to be the son of Saṃghamitta's sister.

The Dpvs, however, mentions the Thera Sumitta who is not mentioned in the Smp. The reference to him occurs in a couplet which deals with chronology and which is very similar to Mhvs V.227. It is difficult to say whether this is a later addition. It is striking that the name of the younger brother of the Thera Kontaputta Tissa is the same as that of the younger brother of Vijaya.

The Dpvs (IV. lines 82 - 85) also gives some details about Soṇaka and Dāsaka which are not given in the Smp. Soṇaka, an intelligent merchant, who came from Kāsī, is said to have entered the pabbajjā in the doctrine of the Teacher at Veḷuvana in Giribbaja,

and Dāsaka is stated to have dwelt at Giribbaja in Magadha. Both these couplets seem to be later interpolations, as they come in the midst of a list of Teachers about the rest of whom no such details are given.

There is no evidence elsewhere of Asoka having had a hundred brothers (V. 18). Tāranātha (Geschichte des Buddhismus in Indian p.28) says that Asoka killed his remaining six brothers at the beginning of his reign. The reference to Asoka's rule extending a yojana upwards and a yojana downwards (V. 23) perhaps shows that a cakravartin ~~had~~ was believed to have powers over non-human beings or that Asoka gained this power by his merit. According to Divyāvadāna (p.406) the yakkhas heard the orders that Asoka gave at the distance of a yojana in the sky and the nāgas heard them at the distance of a yojana below the earth. This also explains how Asoka was able to summon the Nāga king Mahākāla and to send yakkhas to assemble the bhikkhus.

Some of the wonderful things that happened at the coronation of Asoka (v.24) seem to show the influence of the Jatakas. In the Khadirangāra Jātaka (40) a paccekabuddha is said to have cleaned his teeth with a tooth-stick and to have washed his mouth with water from the Anotatta Lake. In the Sona-Nanda Jātaka (532) Sona, placing a carrying pole in the air, travelled in the space to fetch water from

Lake Anotatta. According to the Chaddanta Jātaka (514) Lake Chaddanta was fifty leagues long and fifty leagues broad. In the middle of it for a space extending twelve leagues no Sevāla or Panaka plant was found, and it consisted of water in appearance like a magic jewel. Next there was a thicket of red paddy in water that was as deep as the height of an elephant. In the Saccaṃkira Jātaka (73) a parrot bade farewell saying: "Father, silver and gold have I none, but should you ever want for choice rice come and call out to me, and I, with the help of my kinsfolk, will give you many waggon-loads of rice."

A story of Asoka's previous life (V.49) is given also in the Asokāvadana (La Légende de l'Empereur Asoka, p.226). When the Buddha once came to Rājagṛha he met two boys called Jaya and Vijaya. Jaya made an offering to the Buddha and wished to be a universal ruler. The Buddha then predicted that the boy would be a cakravartin. He would be king under the name of Asoka in the town of Kusumapura and would divide his (Buddha's) relics and make eighty-four thousand stūpas.

That Asoka was a very cruel person before his conversion (V. 189) is also related in the Aśokāvadāna (L.E.A. p.235). It is said that he with his own hand cut off the heads of five hundred of his ministers because they resisted his will. He is also said to have caused five hundred women of the palace to be burnt alive.

For this act he was called Caṇḍāśoka.

Afterwards the king is related to have appointed an executioner to carry out his sentences. He also had a prison built, and any man who entered it was not only tortured but was killed. Once an ascetic named Samudra unwittingly entered and was seized by the jailer. He was given seven days' respite and during that time he reached arahantship. ~~Thus~~ Hence when he was cast into a seething cauldron he was not in the least burnt. The miracle was reported to the king, who ~~seeing it,~~ thereupon embraced the true religion.

According to Tāranātha (p.30) the ~~one~~ person who caused the conversion of Aśoka was a śrāmaṇera called Yaśas. On his advice Aśoka sent for the Arahant Yaśodhvaja because he was in a position to get his sins pardoned. After that Aśoka gave hospitality to thirty thousand bhikkhus. Exhorted by Yaśas he built eighty-four thousand caityas in one day. He then commanded people of all parts to bring to every caitya a thousand lamps, incense and flowers. He also gave hospitality to sixty thousand bhikkhus for three months, and at the end he gave to each bhikkhu a robe worth a hundred thousand pieces. Later, borne by a yakṣa, he visited in seven days all the caityas, and because he built these he was called Dharmāśoka.

According to the Avadāna-kalpalatā, the arahant who advised Aśoka to build the caityas was not Yaśas but Indra. Perhaps this explains the part played by Indagutta in the Mhvs (V. 174)

According to the Aśokāvadana (L.E.A.p. 242) Aśoka went to Rājagṛha and took the four litres of relics buried by King Ajātaśatru. Next he went to Rāmagrāma, but the nāga king Sāgara did not permit him to take the eighth casket. He went then to the sthavira Yaśas at Kukkuṭārāma and said that he desired to build eighty-four thousand stūpas in Jambudvīpa. Then all the stūpas were built at the same time. Afterwards his name Caṇḍāśoka disappeared and he was called Dharmāśoka.

The story of the killing of some bhikkhus by the minister of Asoka (V.240) and the way Tissa prevented him from killing more are not mentioned in the northern accounts. According to the Aśokāvadāna Aśoka kills his ministers with a sword and Tissa is killed by a cowherd.

The story of Nigrodha (V.37) also shows the influence of the Jātakas. According to the Ekapaṇṇa Jātaka (149) the Bodhisat came to Benares, and going in search of alms came to the king's gate. The king saw the Bodhisat from the window and marked within himself how the ascetic, wise in heart and soul, fixing his gaze immediately before him, moved on in lion-like majesty as though at every footstep he was depositing a purse of a thousand pieces. "If goodness dwell anywhere", thought the king, "it must be in this man's breast". So summoning a courtier, he bade him bring the ascetic into his presence. The courtier went up to the Bodhisat and with due obeisance took his alms-bowl from his hand. "Why, O wise man?" asked the Bodhisat. "The king sends for you, sir," replied the courtier. "My dwelling is in the Himālayas, and I have not the king's favour," said the Bodhisat.

So the courtier went back and reported this to the king. Thinking that he had no confidential adviser at the time, the king bade the Bodhisat be brought, and the Bodhisat consented to come. The king greeted him on his entrance with great courtesy and bade him be seated on a golden throne beneath a royal parasol. And the Bodhisat was fed on dainty food which had been made ready for the king's own eating.

The language of the Jātaka also seems to have influenced the account of the Smp, for most of the epithets used in the Jātaka in describing Nigrodha are found also in it. The descriptive epithets in the Dpvs seem to have ~~influenced~~ coloured it less.

The anupubbikathā concerning Nigrodha found in the Smp and the Mhvs seems to have been influenced by the Nigrodha Jātaka (445). A caravan was travelling in front of a merchant's daughter-in-law, and she always came about the time to the place whence that caravan had just gone. And one night a poor woman in that caravan ~~had borne~~ gave birth to a son under a Nigrodha tree; and thinking that without the caravan she could not get along, but that if she lived she might get back the child, she coverdd him up as he was, and left him lying there at the foot of the Nigrodha tree. And the devatā of the tree took care of him. At breakfast time the other travellers arrived at the spot. The babe was seen by the merchant's daughter-in-law. She declared that the babe was her own, and that she had just brought him forth. When the babe came to be named, they called him Nigrodha-kumāra after the place where he was born.

According to the Aśokāvadāna (La Légende de l'Empéreur Asoka p.234) the eldest son of Bindusāra was Susīma and not Sumana (V.41). He offended the king's prime minister, and the latter conspired to exclude him from the throne in favour of Aśoka. Susīma also failed to subdue a rebellion in Takṣaśilā. At the death of Bindusāra the ministers secured the throne for Aśoka. Susīma marched to Pāṭaliputra to assert his rights and expel Aśoka but ~~he~~ failed. During a battle he fell into a ditch full of burning fuel and perished.

~~It is perhaps this struggle for the throne that explains the delay of Aśoka's abhiseka.~~

The story of Moggaliputta Tissa (V.95) as related in the Dpvs and given in greater detail in the Smp and the Mhvs is almost the same as that of Nāgasena in Milinda-Pañha (p.7). The request made by the Theras of the Second Council to Brahma Tissa, the atonement that had to be made by Siggava and Caṇḍavajji for not taking part in the Second Council, the visits made by Siggava for seven years and the way in which the brahman came to give him better treatment after that time, Tissa's education in the Vedas, his entering the pabbajjā, the idea of the parents that he would return, Tissa's going to the Thera Caṇḍavajji and the reception he received there, all have their parallels in the story of Nāgasena. Many paragraphs in the Smp <u>mutatis mutandis</u> are in the exact words of the Milinda-Pañha. The story of Nāgasena, however, is considered a later addition to the Milinda-Pañha, and it is difficult to say which of the ~~two~~ stories is older.

The additions to the story of Moggaliputta Tissa in the Mhvs (V.22) seem to have been borrowed from the Aśokāvadāna and the Milinda-Pañha. According to the Aśokāvadāna (L.E.A. p.246), when Aśoka wished to visit the holy places of Buddhism he was advised to send for Upagupta. The Buddha had predicted that Upagupta would be born a century after his death. At this time Upagupta was dwelling on Mount Urumuṇḍa (Ahogaṅga, V.233) in the Naṭabhaṭika vihāra near Mathurā. He accepted the royal invitation, and attended by eighteen thousand arahants travelled in state by boat to Pāṭaliputra, where he was received with the utmost reverence and honour.

According to the Milinda-Pañha (p.7) the deva Mahāsena was asked three times by Sakka to be reborn in the world of men, but he refused. Then Assagutta, said that there was none to help the sāsana by refuting the heretical views of King Milinda, and asked him to be reborn to give his help to the religion of the Buddha. Then Mahāsena consented.

The story of Dāsaka's conversion (V.105), which is not given in the Dpvs, is also similar to that of Moggaliputta Tissa. The possession of three palaces by Siggava reminds one of Yasa, the son of the seṭṭhi mentioned in Mahāvagga I.7., and of Anuruddha, the Sākiyan, referred to in Cullavagga VII.1. Aggibrahmā (V.169), like Gotama Buddha himself, leaves the world after a son had been born to him. As Saṃghamittā herself entered the order at the age of eighteen, he must have left her very early.

According to one version of Aśokāvadāna called A-yu-wang-tchouan, translated into Chinese about 300 A.D., the younger brother of Aśoka was

called Siu-ta-to (Sukhadatta?) (L.E.A. p.270). Other accounts give him the name Vītāśoka. He was a follower of the heretics, and ridiculed the dharma of the Buddha. When once he went hunting with Aśoka they saw a brahman who warmed himself with the five fires. This brahman lived a strictly ascetic life, but the hardships he endured did not pain him so much as seeing wild animals at rutting-time; for then the fire of concupiscence devoured him. Then Siu-ta-to asked how, ~~said that~~ if this brahman could not get rid of desire, ~~how~~ could the Śākyaputra śramaṇas do it, since they lived a comfortable life.

Aśoka, in order to convert him, tried a stratagem. He got his ministers to make his brother put on the insignia of royalty, and then, pretending to be angry, threatened him with death. Finally he granted him a respite of seven days and allowed him to rule during the period. The fear of death so worked upon Vītāśoka that at the end he embraced the doctrine of the Buddha, in which he was instructed by the sthavīra Yaśas. With difficulty he obtained the permission from Asoka to be a bhikṣu, and went to the Kukkuṭārāma and from there to Videha. Later he withdrew to a distant retreat beyond the frontier.

Once the followers of Nirgrantha made images of the Buddha and represented them as prostrating before the image of Nirgrantha. Aśoka was very angry when he heard of this, and offered a piece of gold for the head of every follower of Nirgrantha. Vītāśoka was mistaken for such a one, and was slain. Aśoka then ordered that henceforth no śramaṇa should be killed.

According to Fa-hsien (Giles' Translation of Travels of Fa-hsien, p.45) the brother of Aśoka who had reached arahantship resided at Gṛdhrakūṭa (Vulture's Peak). Aśoka invited him to the palace, but he refused to come. Aśoka then built a hill for him within the city. Fa-hsien does not give the name of Aśoka's brother, but Hiuen Tsiang (Beal's Translation p.91) in referring to this stone-house built outside the palace, says that the arahant was Aśoka's brother by the same mother and that he was called Mahendra. Hiuen Tsiang also adds that Mahendra was arrogant and cruel and the people complained against him. Mahendra then admitted his guilt and asked for a respite of seven days. Aśoka placed him in a dungeon, and Mahendra on the seventh day reached arahantship. After that he lived the life of a recluse far away from the pollution of the world. Aśoka then invited him ~~then~~ and built this dwelling for him. One hundred years after the death of the Buddha he converted Ceylon.

Vītāśoka is no doubt the same as Tissa of the Mhvs (V.154) and Mahendra of Hiuen Tsiang. Hiuen Tsiang seems to have confused Mahinda of Ceylon with Vītāśoka and given the name of the former to the latter. According to the Aśokāvadāna the name of the bhikkhu who converted Vītāśoka was Yaśas, the head of the Kukkuṭārāma. The Ceylon chronicles attribute the conversion to Dhammarakkhita, the Yona, who went to Aparantaka and is mentioned as the teacher of Nāgasena in the Milinda-Pañha. Mahādeva and Majjhantika ordained Mahinda, and they seem to be

the missionaries who went to Mahisamaṇḍala and the Kasmīra-Gandhāra region.

A legend of King Pradyota (Le Concile de Rājagṛha, p.272) contains a tale similar to that of Vītāśoka. The king, to test whether his son Gopāla was able to succeed him, allowed him to rule in his place for seven days. During this period Gopāla did not permit his officers to punish adulterers and permitted debauchery in his kingdom. After seven days Pradyota took over the government again.

The story of Asoka as related in the Mhvs seems to contain very little information that will stand a historical test. The killing of his brothers is supported by other legends; but Rock Edict V refers to his brothers and sisters. It is doubtful whether Tissa was a historical person. The authors of the Dpvs and of ~~an~~ the account followed by Tāranātha do not seem to have been aware of his existence. The wonders that took place at Asoka's coronation and the part played by the nāga king Mahākāla are obviously not historical.

~~According to~~ From the Edicts it is clear that Asoka favoured Buddhism but it is equally clear from the Edicts that ~~Asoka~~ after his conversion he did not withhold his benefactions from the brahmans and other sects. Hence the statement in the Mhvs (V.74) cannot be true.

Tambapaṇṇi of Asoka's inscriptions may refer to the river in the Tinnevelly district or to Ceylon. The river was known to the author of the Rāmāyaṇa (Bombay Edition IV. 41. 17). Ceylon was known to the Greek writer Onesicritus as Taprobane, while in India Ceylon

seems to have been known as Tambapaṇṇi. It is therefore quite possible that ~~Ceylon is meant~~ by Tambapaṇṇi in the inscriptions of Asoka Ceylon is meant. But all that one can gather from them is that Asoka established medical treatment for men and animals in Tambapaṇṇi and that the conquest of ~~morality~~ dhamma had been ~~won~~ carried by him as far as Tambapaṇṇi. Though there is no doubt that Asoka was a lay-disciple as mentioned in the Dpvs , and favoured Buddhism, there is nothing to show in his proclamations on ~~morality~~ dhamma that they were issued for the propagation of Buddhism, though some parts of them may be traced to the Pāli Canon.

Even if Asoka actually made an attempt to propagate Buddhism in Ceylon, the accounts of his relations with Ceylon in the Dpvs and the Mhvs ch.XI do not seem to have been based on a remembrance of the ~~nature~~ of these communications. The things sent by Devānampiya Tissa were those wonderful things that appeared at his coronation, and some of the ~~things~~ objects sent by Asoka ~~sent~~ are alleged to have ~~had~~ been brought by nāgas and parrots.

The Dpvs account of these communications is a very unsatisfactory record. It seems to be an attempt to form a connected ~~account~~ narrative with the aid of a few verses that had been handed down. These verses embodied a list of the articles sent by Devānampiya Tissa and a list of the articles and the message sent by Asoka.

The five emblems of royalty given in the list are often referred to in the Jātakas, and perhaps the Dpvs is indebted for them to J.530 G.4

or J.538 G.72. Even the message may be an adaptation of the Dhammapada G. 190.

Some of the dates mentioned in the Ceylon accounts of Asoka also do not agree with his inscriptions. According to the Girnar Rock Edict XIII, Asoka's conversion could not have taken place before the eighth year of his reign, as the Kaliṅga War was on his eighth year, but according to the Ceylon tradition he was converted by Nigrodha on his third year. Mahinda and Saṃghamittā entered the pabbajjā on his sixth year; ~~Even~~ if the four years before his abhiṣeka are added it ~~is~~ was in his tenth year. According to the Rūpnāth Inscription for more than a year after his conversion he does not seem to have been a zealous Buddhist. The Ceylon accounts place the pabbajjā after ~~most other~~ such events ~~like~~ as the building of the stūpas. Hence this date is hardly reconcilable with the Inscriptions. ~~No-one~~ And no one can ~~also~~ take seriously the dates attributed to Upāli, Dāsaka and his successors.

There is no reason to doubt that Moggaliputta Tissa was a historical person. He is most probably meant by the inscription in the relic casket from Tope II of the Sānchi group (Cunningham, The Bhilsa Topes p.289). But the accounts given of him do not seem to be historical. It has been pointed out that his early history is similar to that of Nāgasena. The stories of Dāsaka (Mhvs.V.105) and of Buddhaghosa in the Cūlavaṃsa also have a great

resemblance to it. It is possible that like the stories of the lives of the Buddhas there was already an accepted form to describe brahmaṇ converts. His withdrawal to Ahogaṅga and his meeting with Asoka appear to have been taken from the story of Upaguṭpa. The part he plays in the festival and the building of the stūpas is ascribed to Yasa in the northern accounts, while the conversion of Asoka attributed to Samudra and Yasa is in the Ceylon accounts made the work of Nigrodha. In the Aśokāvadana it is Yaśas, the head of the Kukkuṭārāma and the president of the Second Council, who plays the chief part. Aśoka always goes to him for advice and his brother is converted by him. Professor Przyluski points out (L.E.A. p. 60) that in later editions of the Aśokāvadāna, episodes connected with Upagupta and Piṇḍola are introduced in order to glorify these Theras of Mathurā and Kosambī by associating them with Asoka. Moggaliputta Tissa was probably a saṃghathera of Vidisā or of some other place in this region, and the Ceylon accounts seem to glorify him by substituting him for Yasa.

The legends about Moggaliputta Tissa, as well as the story that Asoka was once a viceroy of Avanti, most probably, as Professor Przyluski points out (L.E.A. p. 110), arose in Avanti and not in Ceylon. Perhaps the Buddhists of Avanti claimed Asoka as having been their viceroy, just as the Aśokasūtra and the Kunālasūtra made him a viceroy of Gandhāra.

There is no reference to Mahinda or Saṃghamittā in any account of Asoka in India. It has been pointed out already that Hiuen Tsiang had confused Mahinda with the legendary brother of Asoka. If the Mahinda ~~that~~ who came to Ceylon was a son of Asoka, one would naturally expect some historical evidence about Asoka in the Ceylon narratives; but the Ceylon legends seem to be less in accordance with the inscriptions of Asoka than even the northern accounts, and they always seem to be a much later form of the Indian stories, whenever the accounts are found to be common to both.

Already one similarity between the Aśokāvadāna and the Ceylon Tradition has been mentioned, but there are some more. According to the Aśokāvadāna, Upagupta meets Aśoka and there are four patriachs between him and the Buddha. In the Mhvs Moggaliputta Tissa meets Asoka, and there are four teachers between him and the Buddha. In Gandhāra a son of Asoka called Dharmavivardhana spreads the doctrine and finishes his days in the state of a bhikṣu, and in Ceylon a son of Asoka called Mahinda is the first missionary of Buddhism (L.E.A. p.110).

It is worthy of note that at the time when the ballads of the Dpvs were being composed, the Buddha already had been made a descendant of the mythical king Mahāsaṃmata. The Dpvs makes the Buddha visit Ceylon and ~~makes him~~ predict the coming of Vijaya and Mahinda just as the Aśokāvadāna makes the Buddha visit Kashmir and ~~makes him~~ predict the coming of ~~the Thera~~ Majjhantika. The

Dpvs also tries to connect the legendary Ceylon kings with a legendary Sākiya family and makes Devānaṃpiya Tissa a friend of Asoka. Later tradition in Ceylon says that Aggibrahmā, the husband of Saṃghamittā also entered the Order. It makes the ~~Sumana~~ sāmaṇera Sumana their son, Bhaṇḍuka a relative of Devī, the wife of Asoka, and Nigrodha the son of Asoka's eldest brother. All these ~~facts~~ statements seem to go against the tradition that Mahinda and Saṃghamittā were the children of Asoka.

## Chapter VI.

## THE BUDHIST COUNCILS, SECTS, PATRIARCHS AND MISSIONS.

## The Buddhist Councils, Sects, Patriarchs and Missions.

Many scholars have dealt with the Councils, the Sects, the Patriarchs and the Missions, and it is difficult to throw any further light on the subject. The Mhvs gives accounts of three Buddhist Councils in chapters III, IV, and V, and the Smp(p.102) adds an account of a fourth Council held in Ceylon in the time of King Devānaṃpiya Tissa. Mhvs ch. V gives a list of the Buddhist Schools or Sects and also deals with the succession of Buddhist teachers from Upāli to Moggaliputta Tissa. The account of the Missions is given in ch. XII.

### A. The First and the Second Councils.

The Mhvs account of the First Council gives hardly any information which is not found in the Smp. The few additional details are that besides bhikkhus there were at the funeral of the Buddha, khattiyas, brahmanas, vessas and suddas, and that the bhikkhus betook themselves to Rājagaha on the bright half of the month of Āsāḷha, a fact only implied in the Smp.

The Sumaṅgala Vilāsini gives even a more detailed account of the First Council. It is a more developed form of the story, as according to it the funeral ceremonies lasted three weeks instead of two, as mentioned in the Smp and the Mhvs. It is most likely that the author of the Mhvs utilised the Smp, or rather the original on which both these works seem to have been based.

The author of the Smp has made use of the Cullavagga XI of the Vinaya Piṭaka, but he also gives much information not found in this work. He says that the date of the death of the Buddha was the full-moon day of Visākha, that Mahākassapa was the saṃgha-thera, and that the Master had given him his garment and made him equal with himself. The Dhamma and the Vinaya were to be the teachers after the death of the Buddha. Seven days were spent in performing the funeral ceremonies and seven days in paying homage to the relics. The number of bhikkhus present at the funeral was seven hundred thousand. After the ceremonies connected with the funeral and the relics there were one and half months still left for the approach of the Vassa. Mahākassapa with his bhikkhusaṃgha went to Rājagaha by one way and Anuruddha with his bhikkhusaṃgha took another route. Ānanda went to Sāvatthi, repaired the Jetavanavihāra, and then proceeded to Rājagaha.

In Rājagaha there were eighteen Mahāvihāras. Ajātasattu gave men to repair them and caused a maṇḍapa to be built at the gate of the Sattapaṇṇiguhā on the side of the Vebhārapabbata. Ānanda appeared at the council in a miraculous way. He was not chosen to recite the Vinaya as the Buddha considered Upāli best in the study of the Vinaya. The council lasted seven months, and the earth quaked at the completion of the work.

The story of the objection to Ānanda being chosen and of his reaching Arahantship is described in greater detail in the Smp. The

Cullavagga mentions the parts of the Pātimokkha, the two Vinayas, the Brahmajāla Suttanta, the Sāmaññaphala Suttanta, and the five Nikāyas. The Smp gives also the various parts of the Vinaya up to the Parivāra, and says that the Vinaya is more important than the Dhamma. The Cullavagga calls the assembly a vinayasaṃgīti of the five hundred, but the Smp adds that it is called the council of the Theras because the collection was made by the theras. The Cullavagga does not say how long the council lasted, but the only inference that can be made is that the time taken was a month.

A good deal of the material found in the Smp but not in the Cullavagga may be traced directly or indirectly to the Canon. The Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta mentions that the funeral took place at Upavattana in Kusināra of the Mallas, in the sāl grove between the twin sāl-trees. It also mentions that the Teacher is not dead as long as the Dhamma and the Vinaya stands, and that the Dhamma and the Vinaya would be the teacher after his death. The references to the comparison of the Buddha with Mahākassapa and the giving of the robe are found in Saṃyutta XVI,9 and 11. The fact that Ānanda had grey hairs but was considered a boy by Mahākassapa is mentioned in Saṃyutta XVI.II. According to the Dīgha XVI.6.13 the funeral ceremonies seem to have lasted a week. The prediction about Ānanda's quick release is referred to in the same Suttanta. In the Theragāthā and in the Vinaya there are references to Upāli discussing the rules with the Buddha and the

Buddha or the bhikkhus referring disputes to him. The Vebhāra rock and the Sattapaṇṇiguhā are mentioned in Cullavagga IV. 4. 4.

Some of the details that cannot be traced to the Canon are common to other accounts of the First Council. According to two redactions of the Aśokāvadāna translated into Chinese about 300 A.D. and 512 A.D. (Le Concile de Rājagṛha, p.34), Ānanda goes to the country of the Vṛjis to console the mourning before he goes to Rājagṛha. At Rājagṛha Ajātaśatru provides them with the things needful and offers them the Bamboo Grove. There is no reference, ~~however,~~ to a maṇḍapa being built; but one of the two redactions says that Buddha once saved Ajātaśatru from falling down from a pavilion. The T'a tche tou louen or Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra (C.R.p.55), a commentary attributed to Nāgārjuna and translated into Chinese between 402-405 A.D., also refers to the providing of the necessary things by Ajātaśatru. It gives the position in which Ānanda reached Arahantship, and says that he entered the hall of the Assembly through the key-hole. It says also that Upāli recited the Vinaya because he was the best among the five hundred. In the Kia-ye-kie king (C.R.p.[illegible]3) there is a reference to an earthquake before the council, and according to Mi-cha-sai pou wou fen liu, the Vinaya of the School of the Mahīśāsakas (C.R.p.133) the second month after the death of the Buddha was spent in meditation and all assembled at the beginning of the third month. In the account of the First Council in the Mahāvastu (p.70) Saptaparṇaguhā of the Vaihāya rock is mentioned and

according to the Tibetan Dulva (Rockhill's Life of the Buddha p.152) it is Anuruddha who points out that Ānanda is not an Arahant.

Hence the details that cannot be traced to other sources are that the Buddha died on the full-moon of Visākha. Seven hundred thousand bhikkhus were present at the funeral, and the offerings of the relics lasted a week. Mahākassapa was the saṃghathera, and the Council was of the Theras. ~~The~~ Vinaya is more important than ~~the~~ Dhamma. There were eighteen mahāvihāras at Rājagaha, and Ajātasattu built a maṇḍapa.

The date of Buddha's death as the full-moon day of Visākha is a very late tradition, and does not agree with the time suggested by the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta; and also the time the Council lasted seems to go against the Cullavagga account. The idea of a saṃghathera is also not in harmony with the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, where the Buddha refuses to appoint a successor.

It does not follow that the Cullavagga account itself is historical. Oldenberg and others have shown that the Pāli Canon is a work of gradual development and could not have existed in its present form soon after the death of the Buddha. Prof. Winternitz is of opinion that the Pāli Canon as it is found to-day, is the product of a period later than that of Asoka (Geschichte der Indischen Litteratur, vol.II, p.9)

Franke deals in the J.P.T.S. 1908-1909 with the accounts of the Councils in the Cullavagga, ~~in the J.P.T.S. 1908-1909,~~ and he is of opinion that the accounts of

~~the Councils~~ belong to a time later than that of the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta.

Rhys Davids (Dialogues of the Buddha II p.73) considered the incident connected with Subhadda to be an interpolation in the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta rather than in the Cullavagga XI. A careful examination of the style of the Cullavagga seems to show, however, that it does not belong ~~also~~ to this account either. In many of the accounts of the First Council as related by the other Schools there is no mention of this incident, and it is most likely that it was added later.

As Franke has pointed out, many other paragraphs can be traced to the Pāli Canon. The statement as to what is dhamma and what is not dhamma may have been influenced by Cullavagga VII. V. 2. The qualities of Ānanda and his fitness as well as the fact of his not being an Arahant, are referred to in the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta. The repair of buildings is commanded in Cullavagga VI.V.2 and 3.

Therefore there is hardly any new information in Cullavagga XI, and the account is obviously late. As Franke points out one cannot even conclude from it that it was held immediately after the death of the Buddha. All that one can say is that if a Council was held it must have taken place during the life-time of Mahākassapa, Upāli, and Ānanda.

In the Dpvs there are two accounts of the First Council. They seem

to have been drawn from two different sources, and the verses common to both are perhaps later interpolations.

In the first account the bhikkhusaṃgha chooses five hundred theras, while in the second Mahākassapa chooses five hundred arahants, and he (Mahākassapa) is said to have not had his equal. It is also stated in the second account that the Council took place near the Sattapaṇṇaguhā in Giribbaja of Magadha at the beginning of the fourth month in the beginning of the second vassa, after three months had passed, and that the Council itself lasted seven months.

In the verses common to both accounts there is ~~besides Mahākassapa~~ a list of eight bhikkhus who took part in the Council besides Mahākassapa. Mahākassapa is described in a full line, and every two of the other bhikkhus are mentioned in a line. They were Ānanda, Upāli, Anuruddha, Vangisa, Puṇṇa, Kumārakassapa, Kaccāna and Kotthita. In the first account there is a second list where Mahākassapa, Anuruddha, Upāli and Ānanda are ~~mentione~~ mentioned.

Both accounts are clearly compilations, and it is difficult to say which are the oldest parts; In chapter IV, line sixteen:

"Mahākassapathero ca Anuraddho mahāgaṇi"

may be said to begin another account.

The account in chapter V seems to be closer to the Cullavagga, where Mahākassapa chooses five hundred arahants, but it gives much new information, ~~as~~ for it, like the Smp, says that the Council took

place at the gate of the Sattapaṇṇaguhā at the beginning of the fourth month and that it lasted seven months.

Both the accounts in the Dpvs even go further and call the Council a Theravāda Council, though they do not go so far as the M Ṭ which calls it also a Council of the Vibhajjavādins.

The account of this Council in the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsakas has some similarity to the Dpvs accounts. It is not said there who chose the five hundred arahants. It also gives a list of eight bhikkhus, but they are not all found in the Dpvs list. Those mentioned there are Ajñāta Kaundiṇiya, Purāṇa, Dhārmika Daśabala Kāśyapa, Bhadrakāśyapa, Mahākāśyapa, Upāli and Anuruddha.

In the account of the Second Council the Mhvs gives a few details not found in the Smp which follows to a great extent Cullavagga XII. The Smp does not say that ninety thousand bhikkhus met at Mount Ahogaṅga. The heretical bhikkhus numbered ten thousand. There is also no reference at all to Kālāsoka. Besides what is not found in the Smp, the Cullavagga makes no mention of the following: ~~facts:~~ Eleven hundred and ninety thousand bhikkhus came together under the Thera Revata at Sahajāti. Sāḷha, Revata, Khujjasobhita, Yasa and Sambhūta Sāṇavāsika were pupils of Anuruddha, and ~~that~~ all these bhikkhus has seen the Tathāgata. Twelve hundred thousand bhikkhus came together at Vesāli, and of these Revata was the chief. Revata chose seven hundred arahants, and these met at Vālikārāma and held the second council, which lasted eight months.

There are also a few differences between the Cullavagga and the Mhvs. According to the Cullavagga it was a devatā that appeared to Sāḷha, but according to the Mhvs it was the god Brahmā. The Mhvs says, eighty from the west assembled at Ahogaṅga but some of the readings of the Cullavagga give eighty-eight, while others omit the number altogether. The Cullavagga also says that Yasa was at the Kūṭāgāra Hall.

The Dpvs contains also two accounts of the Second Council. The first one is very brief. It says that one hundred years after the death of the Buddha the Vajjiputtas proclaimed the ten indulgences at Vesāli. Sabbakāmī, Sāḷha, Revata, Khujjasobhita, Yasa, and Sānasambhūta, the pupils of Ānanda and Sumana and Vāsabhagāmi, the pupils of Anuruddha, had seen the Buddha before. Seven hundred bhikkhus assembled at Vesāli and accepted the Vinaya established in the teaching of the Buddha.

The second account is much more detailed and is closer to the Mhvs ~~rather~~ than the Cullavagga. It adds that twelve thousand Vajjiputtakas assembled, and that twelve hundred thousand came together to subdue them. It gives a list of the indulgences in verse unlike the first account, but even these verses may be an interpolation as the metre is so irregular. The eight bhikkhus are called pāmokkhā or chiefs. Asoka, the son of Susunāga, was then king and ruled at Pāṭaliputta. They chose seven hundred arahants, ~~and these~~ who met at the Kūṭāgāra Hall at Vesāli. The Council lasted eight months.

The Dpvs accounts seem to be compilations, but it is difficult to say which are the oldest parts. The prose passage in the first account giving the ten points seems to have been borrowed from the Cullavagga. In the second account the reference to King Asoka may be a later addition. In the Mhvs the Council which dealt with the Canon took place at Vālikārāma, the place where the ubbāhika was held, but according to the Dpvs second account it took place in the Kūṭāgāra Hall, the place where the general assembly met. The Kūṭāgārasālā seems to have been a well known place, as it is mentioned in the Mahāvagga VI. 30. 6. and in the Cullavagga V. 13.3., VI. 5. 1. and X. 1. 2. Vālikārāma is mentioned only in the Cullavagga XII. It is again mentioned in Mhvs V. 107 as the residence of Upāli. The Dulva does not mention the name of either of these vihāras.

Franke deals exhaustively also with the Cullavagga account of the Second Council. He points out that like the account of the First Council, it has been influenced by the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta and other Pāli works.

All the available accounts mention the Vajjiputtakas as having raised the ten points. The Vajjians are referred to as breaking the rules of the Order even in other parts of the Vinaya Piṭaka. According to Cullavagga VII. 4 five hundred Vajjiputtakas joined Devadatta against the Buddha and followed a more ascetic form of life. The Sutta Vibhaṅga I. 7. shows how the novices of the Vajjians got into trouble by disregarding the rules of the Saṃgha.

Though the dispute arose over the acceptance of money by the Vajjiputtaka bhikkhus the number of points is given as ten in all the accounts. There is, however, disagreement over the questions at issue. ~~According to~~ the Tibetan Dulva (Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, p.171) the fourth, the fifth and the sixth points are not mentioned, but instead it is said the Vajjiputtakas held it lawful to exclaim 'alala', to indulge in enjoyment, and to dig the earth with one's own hand or to have it dug.

One cannot take seriously the date of the Council as given in the Cullavagga. It seems to be a convenient round number. According to the Tibetan Dulva it took place a hundred and ten years after. Tāranātha (Geschichte des Buddhismus, p.41) refers to this date but adds that according to other sources the Council was held two hundred and ten or two hundred and twenty years after the death of the Buddha.

There is no mention at all of Kālāsoka in the Cullavagga, the Dulva the Smp or in the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas (Fifth Oriental Congress II. II. 44). According to Tāranātha the Council took place at Kusumapura in the reign of King Nandin. It has been pointed out already that Ajātasattu is not mentioned in the Cullavagga account of the First Council, and that he built a maṇḍapa is recorded only in the Ceylon accounts. It is most likely that kings came into consideration later, and at least in the account of the Second Council, after dates began to be fixed. In the hundredth year after the death of the Buddha according to Ceylon tradition Kālāsoka was the king. According to the Purāṇas

Nandin was the king at Pāṭaliputta one hundred and ten years after the Parinibbāna.

According to Rockhill's Life of Buddha pp.173 and 176, Sarvakāmi, Sālha, and Vāsabhagāmi lived in the time of Ānanda and the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas says that Sabbakāmi, Sambūno (Sambūta), Revata and Vāsabhagāmika were his pupils. Rockhill (p.173) also says that Yaśas and Sālha lived in Sonaka, Sarvakāmi in Vaiśāli, Vāsabhagāmi in Saṃkāśya, Kuyyasobhita(?) in Pāṭaliputra, Ajita in Srughna, Sambhūta in Māhismatī, and Revata in Sahadhsha(?).

Yasa according to the Cullavagga does not represent the bhikkhus of the east, though he is first referred to as wandering in the Vajjian country. One may infer from this account that he was from Kosambī. In the account of the Vinaya of the Mūla Sarvāstivādins he is said to be a bhikkhu of Vasava, a village of the country of the Vṛji. In the Aśokāvadāna he is said to be the head of Kukkuṭārāma in the neighbourhood of Pāṭaliputra. According to Tāranātha he lived to the east of Magadha. According to Rockhill (p.173) he lived in Sonaka. Thus he seems to have been claimed by many places, and it is probable he was a great person in early Buddhist history.

According to Cullavagga XII, Sabbakāmi, the disciple of Ānanda, was the samghathera on the earth but it is Revata who presides over the Council. The Mhvs adds that Revata was the chief of the twelve hundred thousand bhikkhus that came together. In the Cullavagga Revata is also said to be learned in the Āgamas, a term which is used instead of the word Nikāyas by the schools other than the Theravāda. Sāṇavāsi is well

known as the teacher of Upagupta and Madhyāntika, the apostles of Mathurā and Kashmir.

Kosambī on the Yamunā was the capital of the Vatsas or ~~the~~ Vaṃsas. Avanti lay to the south-west of it and its capital was Ujjein. Both these places seem to have been centres of the ~~Sarvāstivādin~~ Theravāda School. (L.E.A., p. 68) MATHURĀ was a centre of the Sarvāstivādin School. Ahogaṅga Mountain was near it and seems to have been the same as Urumuṇḍa of the Sarvāstivādin texts (L.E.A. p.112). According to Suttavibhaṅga I. IV. the Buddha takes a route similar to that of Revata. He starts from Soreyya, passes through Saṃkassa and Kaṇṇakujja, crosses the river at Payāga and arrives at Bārāṇasī, from where he goes on to the Kūṭāgārasālā in Mahāvana at Vesāli. Kern (Manual of Buddhism, p.36) identifies Kaṇṇakujja with Kanauj on the Kāli River in the North Western Provinces and says that Soreyya was near Takkasilā. According to Dh A I.325 Soreyya is a city in the neighbourhood of Sāvatthi, and according to Dh A III.224 Saṃkassa is thirty yojanas from Sāvatthi. According to the Vinaya of the Mūla Sarvāstivādins (L.E.A. p.3) Revata was a town of Kashmir visited by the Buddha. Sahajāti seems to have been in the east as Sāḷha represented the East. Vasabhagāma according to Mahāvagga IX. I. I. was a village in Kāsī.

Pāṭheyyakā is mentioned in Milinda p.331 along with a number of other towns in North India, but it is difficult to judge its position from this list. It is also mentioned in Mahāvagga VII. I. I. and in Saṃyutta II.p.187, and in both the Pāṭheyyakā bhikkhus are said, as in the account of the Second Council, to dwell in forests, live on alms,

dress in rags, and posses only three robes. In the Saṃyutta also there is the reading Pāveyyakā and Professor Geiger prefers this reading to Pāṭheyyakā. In Cullavagga XII. 2. 7. and in Mhvs IV. 47 Pāṭheyyakā stands opposed to Pācīnakā or eastern. Hence there is reason for translating Pāṭheyyakā as western, especially because Revata and Sāṇasambhūta were from the west and did not belong to Pāvā.

In the Vinaya of the Mūla Sarvāstivādins (L.E.A. p.68) the bhikkhus who assembled at the Second Council were from Saṃkāśyā, Pātaliputra, Srughna, Māhismatī(?), Sahajāti and two villages of the Vṛji, Vāsavagrāma and one whose name meant peaceful abode. Soreyya, Kaṇṇakujja, Udumbara, Aggalapura, Kosambī, Ahogaṅga, and Pāṭheyya are not mentioned at all. It is Yasas as in Rockhill (p.173) and not Revata that presides over the Council, and there is no reference to a meeting on the Ahogaṅga Mountain.

Like the Cullavagga, the Dulva and the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas do not refer to another Council after the ten points were settled, and it is mentioned only in the Ceylon accounts. The disagreement as to its place of meeting between the Dpvs and the Mhvs may be due to an error, or it may be that when this part came to be added there was no mention at first of the place where the Council met.

The accounts of the First and Second Council even in the Cullavagga show signs of changes and additions. Otherwise it is difficult to explain many peculiar features in them. It has been already pointed out that the Subhadda episode appears to be a later addition. It is also possible that Upāli did not come into the earliest accounts.

Oldenberg in his Introduction to the Vinaya Piṭaka said that there is no sharp distinction between the Vinaya and the Dhamma in the Pāli Canon, and in the Cullavagga account of the First Council, Ānanda is chosen because he had learnt thoroughly the Dhamma and the Vinaya from the Buddha himself. In another account of the First Council, Ānanda recites both the Dhamma and the Vinaya (C.R. p.3). It is also striking that Upāli plays no important part in any account of the Death and funeral of the Buddha.

The account of the Second Council appears to have gone through much more change. Perhaps the Vinaya of the Mūla Sarvāstivādins records one of the earliest accounts of it. If Māhismatī, which does not occur also in other accounts, is left out, the dispute does not seem to have attracted attention far beyond Vesāli. In Rockhill's account other places are added, but Yaśas as in Mhvs V. 277 still remains the president of the Second Council. The Cullavagga account makes Yasa play the chief part at first, but tries to put into greater prominence later the bhikkhus of the west. It is Revata who presides in spite of the fact that Sabbakāmi of Vesāli is the saṃghathera on the earth. The Council is preceded by another Council at Ahogaṅga Mountain. But for the mention of Kosambī one would imagine that the Cullavagga account belonged to the School of the Sarvāstivādins.

## B. The Sects.

According to the Mhvs the first great schism in Buddhism took

place after the Second Council, and the heretical bhikkhus founded the school called Mahāsaṃghika. According to the Dpvs these bhikkhus did not stop there. "Altering the original redaction they made another redaction. They transposed Suttas which belonged to one place to another place. They destroyed the meaning and the doctrine in the Vinaya and the five collections. The bhikkhus who understood neither what had been in long expositions nor without exposition, neither the natural meaning nor the recondite meaning, settled a false meaning in connection with spurious speeches of the Buddha. They destroyed a great deal of meaning under the colour of the letter. Rejecting single passages of the Suttas and of the profound Vinaya they composed other Suttas and another Vinaya. Rejecting the Parivāra, which is an abstract of the contents (of the Vinaya), the six sections of the Abhidhamma, the Paṭisambhidā, the Niddesa, and some portions of the Jātaka they composed new ones. Forsaking the original rules regarding nouns, genders, composition and the embellishments of style, they changed all that." (Oldenberg's translation).

Vasumitra (Le Concile de Rājagṛha p.310), on the other hand, says that the separation of the Mahāsaṃghikas and the Sthaviras took place ~~in~~ one hundred years after the Nirvāna in Pāṭaliputra in the reign of Aśoka, and that it was provoked by the five points of Mahādeva.

The account of the First Council in the Cullavagga shows that

this was not the first schism. According to it Purāṇa refused to agree to the Pāli Canon as accepted at Rājagaha. In the account of the First Council in the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsakas, who place Purāna next to Ajñāta Kaundinya, Purāṇa and Mahākāśyapa disagree on seven points. In the accounts in the Vinayas of the Dharmaguptakas and the Haimavatas they disagree on eight points.

Moreover in the Mhvs it is the Vajjiputtakas who raise the ten points and they (V.6) are said to have broken away along with the Mahiṃsāsakas from the Theravāda School some time after the Mahāsaṃghika School had separated.

According to Bhavya (Rockhill p.182) the division between the Sthaviras and the Mahāsaṃghikas took place in the reign of Dharmāśoka one hundred and sixty years after the death of the Buddha. He does not mention the Second Council as the cause of this division. Another account (Rockhill p.187) says that one hundred and thirty seven years after the death of the Buddha King Nanda and Mahāpadma convened the Āryas at Pāṭaliputra and on account of the five propositions this division arose. According to ~~Saint~~ Stanislaus Julien (Journal Asiatique, V.Série, Tome XIV. pp.333, 336 and 343) the Chinese sources date this division one hundred and sixteen, one hundred and sixty, and one hundred years after the death of the Buddha. Hiuen Tsiang (C.R. p.284) gives a tradition according to which the Mahāsaṃghikas did not even participate in the Council of Mahākassapa, but held a Council of their own.

It is clear from these contradictions that one cannot consider that the first division into two schools arose as a result of the ten points raised by the Vajjiputtakas. At present there is no evidence to show that the Mahāsaṃghika accepted these ten points, and it is clear from the Mhvs that the Vajjiputtakas did not belong to this school.

According to all accounts the number of the Schools is eighteen, though the lists do not always ~~do not~~ agree, and the first division was into Mahāsaṃghika and Sthavira. Professor Geiger has made an analysis of these lists in Appendix B to his translation of the Mhvs. Professor Przyluski deals with the Buddhist Sects both in La légende de L'Empéreur Aśoka and in Le Concile de Rājagṛha, Part III, and sheds much new light on the subject.

The chief centres of the Mahāsaṃghika School seem to have been in Magadha, and the Theravādins seem to have been in Kosambī and the South such as Avanti. The Sarvāstivādins were in Mathurā and Kashmir (C.R. p.308). The Sammitīyas were in the West in Lāṭa (Gujarat) and Sind. The Mahīśāsakas seem to have lived in the South. Purāṇa according to the Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas lived in the South, and the Cullavagga XI. I. 10 says he came from Dakkhiṇāgiri. Mahāvagga I. 53 and VIII. XII. 1. and Saṃyutta XVI. II. 4 also mention Dakkhiṇāgiri, but always ~~as~~ in reference to some one going from Rājagaha to Dakkhiṇāgiri or vice versa. The Mhvs XIII. 5. makes it clear that Dakkhiṇāgiri lay between Pāṭaliputra and Vidisa. The Mahīśāsakas seem to have lived not far from the Theravādins in India, and also to have gone to Ceylon, as Fa-hsien is said to have brought the Vinaya of the Mahīśāsakas from there (C.R.

p.133). According to some accounts of the Second Council, Māhiṣmatī was an important centre of Buddhism and Professor Przyluski (C.R. p. 324) seems to think that this was the chief seat of the Mahīśāsakas. The Kāśyapīyas seem to have been a subdivision of the Haimavatas and to have lived in the Himālaya district (C.R. p.316). The Dharmaguptakas appear to have lived in the West (C.R. p.325). The Vātsīputras probably belonged to Vatsa, the chief town of which was Kosambī.

At least in the early stages of Buddhist history the sects do not seem to have lived in enmity. On the other hand the different Schools seem to have influenced one another. According to Vasumitra the Buddha is said to have prophesied that the twelve future schools would be the repositories of the diversified fruits of his scriptures without priority or inferiority, just as the taste of sea-water is everywhere the same or as the twelve sons of one man all honest and true. In the account of the First Council the disagreement between Mahākassapa and Purāṇa seems to have ended peaceably. Both the accounts of the First two Councils and the Mahāvaṃsa itself show how the members of one School were prepared to borrow from others.

It is possible the divisions arose mainly with the spread of Buddhism. It was not unnatural for the Buddhists in different parts of India under different conditions to modify their ideas and practices or to add to them as necessity arose.

## C. The Patriarchs.

The Mhvs (V. 104) the Smp and the Dpvs all give an ācāriyaparampar ā

or succession of teachers. They are Upāli, Dāsaka, Sonaka, Siggava, and Moggaliputta Tissa.

According to the Bu Commentary (Bu. p.XI) ~~the unbroken succession of~~ the theras ~~that~~ who perpetuated in unbroken succession the Bu were Sāriputta, Bhaddaji, Kosiyaputta Tissa, Siggara, Moggaliputta, Sudatta, Dhammika, Dāsaka, Sonaka and Revata.

The list ~~of~~ in the Vinaya of the Mahāsamghikas (L.E.A. p.44) is Upāli, Daśabala (Dasaka?) Jyotidarsa (?), Jita (?) and Indriyarakṣita (?).

In the Aśokāvadāna the teachers are Mahākāśyapa, Ānanda, Sāṇavāsa and Madhyāntika, Upagupta and Dhītika, Kṛṣna and Sudarśana.

In the early centuries of Buddhism there were teachers of the Dhamma and teachers of the Vinaya. This specialisation seems to have made certain groups give preference to the part of the Canon in which they were versed. Hiuen Tsiang says (L.E.A. p.20) that in Mathurā those who studied the Abhidhamma made offerings to Śāriputra; those who indulged in ~~meditation~~ dhyāna, to Mudgalaputra; those who read and maintained the Sūtra, to Pūrṇamaitrāyaṇīputra and those who applied themselves to the Vinaya, to Upāli.

The rivalry that existed between the teachers of the Dhamma and of the Vinaya is also apparent in Aśokāvadāna (L.E.A. p.21). Two bhikṣus discuss the question of bahuśruta and the observation of the prohibitions. A bhikṣu who does not break the minor rules

is defined as a vanquisher of the prohibitions. One who has heard completely and who has heard without any alteration, is defined as a bahuśruta. Then Sāṇavāsa, correcting the two bhikṣhus, gives other definitions. He who has all pure views maintains the rules in their purity. One who acts in conformity with that which he has heard, is called a bahuśruta.

It is clear from the account of the First Council in the Mhvs that the bhikkhus of Mahāvihāra were Vinayists, because it is said in it that the Vinaya is more important than the Dhamma. Probably the Sarvāstivādins put more emphasis on the Dhamma and traced their teachers to Ānanda and Mahākassapa. The account of the Second Council shows that some traced their succession to Anuruddha. The list in the Bu Commentary seems to be a mixture of two successions. Probably they are the successors of Sāriputta and Upāli.

The institution of the Patriarchs could not have arisen at the beginnings of the history of Buddhism. The Mahāparinibbāna Sutta makes it clear that the Buddha refused to appoint a successor to take his place. It is also clear that at no time was the one supreme Thera over all. According to the account of the First Council Purāṇa refused to follow the lead of Mahākassapa. In the account of the Second Council, though Sabbakāmi is said to be samghathera on earth, it is Revata who presides over the Council.

It appears that each place or district had its saṃghathera, and in later times they traced their succession to Mahākassapa, Upāli or some other. ~~This also perhaps explains why some of the saṃghatheras played no part in the Second Council~~.

## D. The Third Council.

There is no mention of the Third Council in sources outside Ceylon unless the Council is the same as that where Mahādeva raised the five points. The Smp account is a little more detailed than that of the Mhvs. It adds, for instance, that Asoka caused white robes to be given to Titthiyas before they were expelled. In the Dpvs there are two accounts as in the case of the first two Councils, and ~~like them~~ they again seem to have been drawn from two different sources. These accounts are undoubtedly compilations, and parts of them may have been added later.

According to the ~~Dpvs~~ first account of the Dpvs (VII. 37) two hundred and thirty six years after the death of the Buddha, Ājivakas and other heretics ruined the doctrine. Moggaliputta Tissa, the Gaṇapamokkha or chief of the saṃgha, surrounded by one thousand Bhikkhus, convened a Council and destroyed the heretical doctrines. He also established the Theravāda and proclaimed the Kathāvatthu.

In the second account (VII. 44) the interruption of the Pātimokkha ceremonies and the killing of the bhikkhus are mentioned, ~~but these seem to be later interpolations~~. It is also recorded that sixty thousand bhikkhus assembled to ~~put an end to~~ suppress the infidels,

and that Asoka destroyed their emblems. After that Moggaliputta Tissa with one thousand arahants, ~~Moggaliputta Tissa~~ held at Asokārāma the Third Council, which lasted nine months.

Thus according to the first account Asoka plays no part, and in ~~In~~ the second he is said to have broken the emblems of the infidels. According to the Smp and the Mhvs he takes the side of the Vibhajjavādins and gives his protection to the Third Council.

In the Kauśāmbī, the Sāñchī and the Sārnāth pillar-edicts, Aśoka orders bhikkhus and bhikkhunīs who ~~to~~ break up the Saṃgha, to be clothed in ~~caused to put on~~ white robes and to reside in a non-residence, but there is no mention anywhere in his Inscriptions of a Buddhist Council. It is clear that Asoka cannot be placed ~~judged~~ in the same category ~~way~~ as Kālāśoka, but it is difficult to think that he took the side of one sect or gave his authority ~~protection~~ for a Council to rehearse the Scriptures of that sect. Even in the accounts of the Second Council, it is only the Ceylon records that refer to a rehearsal of the Canon.

It has already been pointed out elsewhere that the accounts about the life of Moggaliputta Tissa do not seem to be historical. There is the additional record ~~fact~~ that the Pāli work, Kathāvatthu (V.278) was composed by him.

Mrs. Rhys Davids, in her Introduction to "Points of Controversy" (Kathāvatthu) says: "We are entitled to conclude, as to its date relative to its own Piṭaka, only thus much: that the

Kathāvatthu was compiled when the contents of at least parts of the first and second ~~and last~~ books of the Abhidhamma Piṭaka were already established as orthodox doctrine in the Sāsana. Whether those works were, in Asoka's time, the completed compilations we now know as Dhamma- saṅgani, Vibhaṅga, Paṭṭhāna, is a further question. But as to the other two Piṭakas-Vinaya, Sutta - there can be no question as to ~~our volume~~ the Kathāvatthu being a much younger compilation. Other canonical books, notably the Niddesas, the Paṭisambhidāmagga, the Thera-therīgāthā and even the Saṃyukta Nikāya, all of them in the Sutta Piṭaka, quote from other works in the same Piṭaka, passages given as authoritative doctrine, and hence belonging to a canonical stock of records. But the Kathāvatthu quotes from a greater number of Sutta books than any of them, and from the Vinaya. It does not trouble to specify the sources it draws from. All, even the Vinaya, are for its compilers Suttanta."

Again she says: "The orthodox tradition maintains that the outlines or heads of the discourses, two hundred and sixteen, more or less, were drawn up by the far-seeing Founder himself, in anticipation of the warring opinions that would arise eventually within the Saṃgha or Sāsana and threaten its disruption. The truth, underlying, for me, this legend is the slow growth, by accretions, of the work itself. No work put together for a special occasion or to meet an entirely new need could conceivably

have assumed the "patch-work-quilt" appearance of the Kathāvatthu."

Thus according to Mrs.Rhys Davids this is one of the latest works of the Pāli Canon, and additions have been made to it in later times. Dr.Mc.Govern (A Manual of Buddhist Philosophy p.15), after pointing out that the Sūtra and the Vinaya Piṭakas of the Sthaviravādins are essentially the same as those of the other Hīnayāna schools, says: "One point, however, deserves attention, and that is the complete absence of all North Indian mentions of the Abhidharma books of the Pāli Canon. The Pāli school makes very sweeping claims for itself. It claims that Pāli was the original language of the Buddha, that the seven Abhidharma works are part of his gospel, and that they were recited at the first council. It is also stated that Buddhaghosa, the great commentator, came from somewhere in North India, and was a scholar of some repute before his arrival in Ceylon. Both of these statements imply a close relationship between the Ceylonese Buddhist school and that of India. It is therefore important to point out the following facts: The only Hīnāyāna Abhidharma Piṭaka which we can prove to be known to the Buddhists of North India was that of the Sarvāstivādins. For a long time it was thought that these works were but different versions of the Pāli Abhidharma Canon, or that if different, the Sarvastivādin works were probably half commentaries or rewritings of the works preserved for us in Ceylon.

We now know, however, that there is no connection between the

two sets of works, that the Sarvāstivādin writings were composed by persons whom it is scarcely possible to conceive could have seen the Pāli works, or even to have heard of their categories. Nor do we find any scholar either inside or outside the Sarvāstivādin school who accepted, quoted or even attacked the Pāli Abhidharma works. They were completely ignored as far as we have any record, and though the Sthaviravādins were cited from time to time, there is no place where we can identify their quoted statements in such a way as to prove the possession of a definite Abhidharma Canon. Furthermore, there are several places where the Sautrāntikas agree with the Sthaviravādins as opposed to the Sarvāstivādins, but in their arguments with the latter they merely say: "We do not accept the Abhidharmapiṭaka, but hold only to the Sūtras." but as in these passages the seven works of the Sarvāstivādins are expressly referred to, it is curious that the Sautrāntikas do not mention any rival Abhidharmapitaka, particularly as the existence of such a rival would have been an arguement against accepting any Abhidharma Piṭaka.

In the same way whenever the Mādhyamika philosophers refer to the Hīnayāna Abhidharma works, the Sarvāstivādins are the only ones quoted. In fact, among the Mādhyamikas the term Abhidharmika is used as a synonym for Sarvāstivādin.

It is difficult to argue from silence, but in any case

it can be seen that the Pāli Abhidharma can never have been considered the fountain-head of wisdom among the North Indian Buddhists. It was probably composed in South India, where Buddhist philosphy developed on lines of its own.

Secondly, as regards Buddhaghosa; he can hardly have been a North Indian, because we know that in North India the Sarvāstivādin influence was particularly strong, and yet in his Attha Salinī he mentions various opinions concerning the Abhidharma Piṭaka, but makes no reference to the Sarvāstivādin Abhidharma."

These facts only tend to show that even the statement that the Kathāvatthu was composed by Moggaliputta Tissa, is no more historical than the other statements about his life.

## E. The Fourth Council.

The Smp alone gives an account of a Fourth Council, which is as follows: King Devānaṃpiya Tissa asked Mahinda whether the Śāsana was well established in Tambapaṇṇidīpa; and Mahinda replied that the Śāsana was established, but the roots would not be deep till a young man born in Tambapaṇṇi of parents who ~~are~~ were dwellers in Tambapaṇṇi, having entered the pabbajjā in Tambapaṇṇi and having learnt the Vinaya in Tambapaṇṇi would teach it in Tambapaṇṇi. Then King Devānaṃpiya Tissa built a maṇḍapa like the one put up by King Ajātasattu.

At that time sixty-eight thousand bhikkhus assembled in the

Thūpārāma. A seat facing south was made for Mahinda. A dhammāsana facing north was made for Mahāriṭṭha, and he sat there requested by Mahinda. The sixty-eight mahātheras, whose leader was Mahinda, then surrounding the dhammāsana sat down. Next the younger brother of the king Mattābhaya, saying: "I shall learn the Vinaya," with five hundred bhikkhus surrounding the dhammāsana, sat down. The remaining bhikkhus, with the members of the royal family and the people, sat down in the seats prepared for them. Then ~~the~~ Mahāriṭṭha spoke the subject matter of the Vinaya, beginning: "At that time Buddha Bhagavā was living at Veranjā at the foot of the Nalerupucimaṇḍa." At the end of the recital the sky shouted a great shout. There ~~was the sound of~~ broke forth untimely lightning. The devatās gave applause, and the earth quaked up to the edge of the water. Thus Mahāriṭṭha with the sixty-eight separate groups led by Mahinda ~~with~~ and as many mahātheras free from the āsavas and surrounded by sixty-eight thousand bhikkhus, at the Pavāraṇā on the first day of Kattika in the middle of the Thūpārāma vihāra proclaimed the Vinayapiṭaka. In that assembly the leader was Mahinda.

## F. The Missions.

The Smp account of the Missions is very similar to that of the Mhvs. The Mhvs, however, adds that the missionaries were sent in the month of Kattika, and the Smp mentions the names of the other missionaries to the Himālaya not given in the Mhvs: Kassapagotta, Alakadeva, Dundubhissara, and Sahadeva.

The Dpvs does not give any of the details with regard to the numbers of those converted by each of the missionaries. Instead of Devadūta Suttanta (XII. 29) it says Nirayadukkha, and does not mention where Rakkhita (Mhvs. XI. 31) went to or what was preached by Soṇa (Mhvs XII. 51). The Dpvs, however, gives the names of the missionaries who went to the Himālayas. They are called Kassapagotta, Durabhissara, Sahadeva and Mūlakadeva.

Many of the verses of the Dpvs are irregular in metre and are not the same as those quoted in the Smp (p.66). The language of the prose parts of the Smp sometimes seems closer to the Dpvs account. Perhaps the verses of the Smp are an improved version as the verses in it are quite metrical.

Most of the places to which the missions were sent have been identified. Kasmīra (XII. 3) ~~was~~ is the modern Kashmir. Gandhāra was the northern part of Punjab. Mahisamaṇḍala was probably the district south of the Vindhya Mountains. The Vanavāsins are said to have been a people of South India. Aparanta consisted of northern Gujarat, Kāthiāwar, Kachchh and Sindh. Mahāraṭṭha was the country of the Marāṭhīs. The country of the Yonas was perhaps Bactria. It is difficult to say where Suvaṇṇabhūmi was situated. It may have been Burma, a country in Bengal, or the country along the River Son in Central India, (Geiger's Translation of the Mhvs pp. 82 - 86).

There is no reason to doubt that the missionaries mentioned are historical persons. In the relic-urns of the Bhilsa Topes, the

name~~s~~ of Kassapagotta, as the teacher of the Himālaya and as the son of Kotiputta, ~~are~~ is mentioned. Dadabhisara (Dundubhissara?) is mentioned as the son of Gotiputta (i.e.Kotiputta). Madhyāntika (Majjhantika) has already been referred to as a great teacher of Kashmir.

There is also no reason to doubt that in the time of Asoka there was a spread of Buddhism. The peaceful conditions, the increased trade with foreign countries, the diplomatic missions, and the favour shown by Asoka himself to Buddhism, are likely to have given a stimulus to Buddhist activity. It seems also very probable that Buddhism spread to Ceylon ~~only~~ first at this time.

The number of the Missons, however, makes the account a little suspicious. Again, why should Madhyāntika, the apostle of the Mūlasarvāstivādins be sent by Moggaliputta Tissa? It has already been shown how fictitious are the other accounts about the life of Moggaliputta Tissa, and this seems to be another attempt to glorify him. It is possible that most of the missionaries mentioned were contemporaries of Moggaliputta Tissa, but it is difficult to believe that all of them went as the request of Moggaliputta Tissa, who seems to be ignored by the other Schools.

## G. The Councils: the Conclusions.

It has been already pointed out how difficult it is to believe in the historicity of the First Council. ~~No-one can say~~ It cannot be definitely ~~whether~~ asserted that there was such a Council even if the Pāli

Canon was not rehearsed at it.

Almost every school, ~~however,~~ has its own account of this First Council, but they all differ either as to the texts recited or as to their order of recital (C.R. Parts I. and II.). Therefore it is clear that the records of the Councils as they exist to-day are later than the composition of those parts of the Canon mentioned in the accounts of the respective schools. Also no account of the First Council, as Professor Weller points out (Asia Major Vol. V. Fasc.2. p.165), seems to be based on one original account. Similarly a comparision of the Pāli Dīgha Nikāya with the Chinese translations of the Dīghāgama (Ibid p.154) shows that no ~~two single~~ traditions can directly be the source of one of the other. On the other hand the texts are too similar to leave any doubt that they had a common source. The central Asiatic fragments also show that they too are not based on other existing texts.

These facts seem to show that in the early stages of Buddhist history there was one common Buddhist tradition, and such a tradition could not have existed unless there were united decisions as to what were the genuine teachings of the Buddha.

The Cullavagga IV. 4. perhaps partly explains how it was that in early stages there was such a common tradition. According to it the Malhan Dabba was appointed regulator of lodging-places, and he saw that the repeaters of the Suttantas were placed together so that they might be able to chant over the Suttantas to one another.

Similarly the repeaters of the Vinaya were put together so that they might be able to discuss the Vinaya with one another. The same was done with the other repeaters.

The rules by which a text was considered genuine are given in the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta (IV. 7). A bhikkhu could put forward as a teaching of the Buddha if he had received it (1) from one who had heard it from the Buddha himself, (2) from a company of bhikkhus who had elders and leaders, (3) from some elders of the Saṃgha deeply read, holding ~~in~~ to the faith as handed down by tradition, versed in the truths, versed in the regulations of the Saṃgha and versed in the summaries of the doctrines and the law, or (4) from one elder similar to those already mentioned. Then every word and syllable had to be carefully understood, and then put beside Suttas and compared with the rules of the Saṃgha. If, when so compared, they were not in harmony, they would be rejected, but if they were in harmony they were accepted.

The First Council is said to have been held in the Vassa season when it was the custom for the bhikkhus to cease wandering and to reside in a definite place. The Third and Fourth Councils are said to have ended with the pavāraṇā ceremony, which was held at the end of the Vassa season. At this season it was the custom to recite the teachings of the Buddha, and ~~therefore~~ most probably therefore there were not four Councils, but ~~there were~~ Councils were held every year from the

earliest times, when those who recited the Vinaya or the Dhamma compared their statements and saw that they were in accordance with the rules which they later believed the Buddha himself had laid down.

Professor Przyluski (Le Parinirvāṇa et les Funérailles du Buddha (Journal Asiatique 1918 - 1920) points out that the first the centre of Buddhism was Rājagaha, and then ~~it was~~ Vesāli. The third great period of Buddhism was in the time of Asoka, when Buddhism spread far and wide. Thus it is most probable that, although the separation of the Vajjiputtakas and the expulsion of the schismatic members of the Orders by Asoka are historical facts, the accounts of the Councils that dealt with the Pāli Canon are not themselves historical records but only express the continuity of the Buddhist tradition during the three great periods of its development. The story of the Council in Ceylon in the reign of Devānaṃpiya Tissa, which is not mentioned in the Dpvs or the Mhvs, and the mention of the fact that Mahinda brought the Buddhist Canon and the Aṭṭhakathā and that he received the Vinaya through a succession of teachers who went back to Upāli himself, seem also to express ~~also~~ nothing more than a strong belief in this continuity of the tradition.

Professor Weller is also convinced that the various Chinese texts of the Dīghāgama and the Pāli Dīgha Nikaya are derived from an original written work, and that the Pāli Dīgha

Nikāya must have been for the first time written down in India. He also shows conclusively that the verses dealing with the writing down of the Scriptures for the first time in Ceylon are interpolations both in the Dpvs (lines 42 - 45) and in the Mhvs (XXXIII. 100 - 101), and that the verses by themselves give no information as to ~~when, where or~~ who wrote down the Scriptures or when and where? It is also difficult to believe that the Pāli Canon, which shows signs of changes and interpolations (Vide Le Parinirvāna et Les Funérailles du Buddha), if it had been for the first time written down in Ceylon, would not have betrayed some sign of it, like the last text of the Vinaya, the Parivāra.

## Chapter VII.

## VIJAYA AND THE ORIGIN OF THE SINHALESE.

## Vijaya and the Origin of the Sinhalese.

The story of Vijaya, his ancestry, his journey to Ceylon and his rule there are related in chapters VI and VII of the Mhvs.

The legend is one that has gradually developed and can be traced to various sources. The account in the Dpvs. is brief and lacks the embellishments found in the Mhvs. It is obviously a compilation, and parts of it may have been added at different times. Perhaps the original account consisted only of lines 3 - 8 ~~of Chapter IX, lines 1 and 2 on page 55 and lines 2 and 3 on page 56,~~ 11-12, and 42-43 of chapter IX

The Dpvs. account, even as it is found in the text, omits many facts mentioned in the Mhvs. There is no record, for instance, of Kaliṅga, the passionate nature of the princess, the prophecy about her marrying a lion, her following a caravan and how she happened to live with a lion. It is also not stated that the children were twins or why Sīhabāhu left the cave with his mother and sister. There is no reference to the meeting with her cousin, called Anuro in the M.T., and the miraculous incidents which led to the recognition and the marriage of the princess with him or to the subsequent killing of the lion by Sīhabāhu.

The Dpvs., however, adds that the name of the princess was Susīmā, who in the M.T. (p.167) is called Suppādevī, and that Vijaya also stopped at Bharukaccha for three months before he came to Laṁkā.

Hiuen Tsiang, in his accounts of his travels, gives the stories that were attempts to explain the origin of the word Siṁhala. The story of the prince Siṁhala , which he narrates, does not contradict anywhere the Dpvs. account, but it is more detailed like the Mhvs. in many parts. It does not mention Vaṅga like the Dpvs. but refers to the father of the princess as a ruler of South India. The princess did not run away from her home, but met the lion when returning from a visit and the guard then deserted her. When the princess returned with her children, the country did not belong to her parents and the village people provided them with food. The lion then ravaged the village, and Siṁhala killed his father with a knife, for a reward. He was able to do it as the lion made no attempt to harm him. Hiuen Tsiang, however, does not point out that a person possessing friendly feelings towards others cannot be hurt, that the king had a thousand pieces ~~led~~ carried on an elephant's back as the reward for the one who seized the lion, and that twice his mother prevented him from killing his father.

Siṃhala does not found a city, but for parricide is banished along with his sister, and each is sent in a separate boat. Siṃhala reaches Ratnadvīpa, which Hiuen Tsiang identifies with Laṅkā on account of the gems found there. There he killed a merchant chief, but retaining his children he extended his race. Because Siṃhala got his name by capturing a lion, the country was called Siṃhala after him.

Hiuen Tsiang relates another tale which seems to be derived by a combination of this with the Vatahassa Jātaka (p.196) It is clearly a compilation, as at the beginning Siṃhala's father is represented as a merchant but later as a king. The reference to the choice of Siṃhala as king and his departure to Ratnadvīpa subsequently in this story may have influenced the Mhvs. account, where Sīhabāhu hands over the kingdom to his mother's husband and goes to Sīhapura. Even the last part of the first tale may have been influenced by the Vatāhassa Jātaka.

A comparison of these accounts seems to suggest that the original of these legends was the first story related by Hiuen Tsiang. The story is found there perhaps in its ~~purity~~ original form. All that is mentioned about places is that the father of the princess was a ruler of Southern India and that Siṃhala went to Ratnadvīpa.

Hiuen Tsiang mentions also a Mahāratnadvīpa renowned for its jewels and inhabited by spirits, and it is difficult to say whether Hiuen Tsiang correctly identifies Ratnadvīpa with Ceylon. In the story of Sārthavāha in the Avadāna Śataka, a merchant, goes to Ratnadvīpa and collects jewels. In the Harivaṃśa (Langlois' translation, p.402), there is an account of Ratnadvīpa, but it does not seem to be that of Laṅkā. Langlois identifies it with Madagascar.

The founding of Sīhapura related both in the Dpvs. and the Mhvs. is reminiscent of Jātaka 422. There the third son of Ceti is told: "You leave by the West gate and go straight on till you see a maned lion; that will be a sign that you are to lay out a city there and dwell in it, and it shall be called Sīhapura."

There seem to have been many Siṃhapuras in ancient times. The Mahāvastu (vol. III. p.432) refers to a Siṃhapura in Kaliṅga. Hiuen Tsiang refers to a Siṃhapura in the Punjab, and the Rājataraṅgiṇī mentions another near Kashmir. In the Dpvs. the position of Sīhapura is given in a couplet which seems to be a later addition, and whoever added this couplet seems to have identified Sīhapura with Sīhor in Kāthiāwar. Lāṭa, according

to Hiuen Tsiang and Yi-tsing was the country where the Budhist sect called the Sammitīya lived. There is no doubt that the ~~Dīpavamsa~~ Dpvs like the Jātaka refers to a Sīhapura in the West, as both Bharukaccha and Suppāra are mentioned as the place where Vijaya landed.

The ~~Mahāvansa~~ Mhvs, on the other hand, seems to refer to a Sīhapura in the East. The Lāṭa he refers to is not in the West but between Magadha and Vaṅga. Bharukaccha is not referred to, but Kaliṅga is mentioned. Burnouf (Recherches sur la Geographie Ancienne de Ceylon, p.61) identifies Lāla with Rāḍhā, the lower part of Bengal on the right bank of the Hugli consisting of Tamlūk and Midnapur. Sūrpāraka, on the West (Ind.Ant. Vol.XI. p.236) seems to have been well known but it is not impossible that there was also a Sūrpāraka on the East, as Lassen, in the map in his Ind.Alt.Vol.III. gives a Sippara at the mouth of the river Mahānadī. The Eastern route was well known at the time the Mhvs. was composed. Fa-hsien, who came to Ceylon at the beginning of the fifth century A.D., travelled by sea from Tāmralipti. It is clear that in the 12th.century A.D. the Siṃhapura of Vijaya was believed to be in Kaliṅga, for King Niśśanka Malla (A.I.C. No.149) says that Vijaya was born there. Hence there is every reason to think that the author of the Mhvs. had Sīhapura in Kaliṅga in mind when he composed the account of Vijaya.

The Western route seems to have been known much earlier. According to Jātaka 463 Prince Suppāraka lived in Bharukacchā; and in Jātaka 360, Sagga, the minstrel of King Tamba travels from Benares to Bharukacchā and then sails to Nāgadīpa, which lay to the South of India.

Other Jātakas too seem to have influenced the story. The exploits of Vijaya and his followers remind one of Ghata Jātaka (454) where the king's nephews plundered the country. When the people complained, the king rebuked the foster-father of the princes three times. Finally when the plundering did not cease he threatened him. It is significant that the language of this Jātaka has influenced the ~~Dīpavaṃsa~~ Dīpavaṃs account.

According to the Sutana Jātaka (398), when there were no more men willing to take the rice to the yakkha, a minister said to the king: "Let us put a packet of a thousand pieces on an elephant's back and make proclamation by dawn: 'Who will take the rice and go to the yakkha will get this wealth.'" The Bodhisat wished to go but his mother forbade him twice; but the third time, without asking her, he offered to take the rice and took the thousand pieces. (VI. 24)

Perhaps Franke is right when he says that the line in the

Dpvs. giving the name of Vijaya shows the influence of Jātaka 546 G.68. The reference to the birth of twin sons sixteen times may be due either to the influence of J.465, or to the story of the Sakiyas where there are also some other resemblances to the story of Vijaya. Hiuen Tsiang makes Siṃhala himself the founder of the Sinhalese race, but according to the Dpvs. and the Mhvs. it is Vijaya, the son of Sīhabāhu or Sīhala. In the genealogy of the Buddha, given in the Dpvs. and explained in the M.T. p.81, a dynasty is not named after its founder but after the father of the founder. Hence making Vijaya the founder instead of Sīhala is more in keeping with this conception.

The story of Kuvaṇṇa and the influence of the Valāhassa Jātaka has already been dealt with elsewhere. This story is not found in the Dpvs., nor is there the account of Vijaya's marriage with the princess of Madhurā. According to Mhvs. VIII. 17, Paṇḍuvasudeva could not be consecrated King till he had a consort. Therefore it is probable that the story of Vijaya's marriage with the princess of Madhurā came to be added, as in ancient India a king could not properly be consecrated unless a queen of the kṣatriya caste was also

consecrated with him (Ceylon Journal of Science Vol.I. p.35) The coming of a thousand families of the eighteen guilds along with the princess may be traced to the influence of the Jātakas such as No.538.

One of the striking features in the development of the legend is the addition of details with regard to places and of names of persons whose names are not given. The Dpvs. gives Vaṅga instead of a country of South India. It adds the town Sīhapura and then gives it as situated in Lāḷa. Then it goes on to mention Suppāra and Bharukaccha as places touched by Vijaya. Finally it gives the name Tambapaṇṇi as the place occupied instead of Ratnadwīpa.

The Dpvs. also gives the original name of Siṃhala as Sīhabāhu, and the names of his sister and mother as Sīhasīvali and Susīma. The Mahāvaṃsa adds the name of Kalinga and Magadha, but leaves out Susīmā and Bharukaccha.

The process is carried on. The M.T. calls the princess cousin Anuro, the attendant of Kuvaṇṇa, Sīsapati, the bride's father Mahākālasena, the bridge Polamittā, ~~and~~ the mother Goṇḍa, and the mother of Sihabāhu, whose name is omitted in the Mhvs., Suppādevi, while according to the Dpvs. she was

already called Susīmā. The Uttaravihāraṭṭhakathā (M.T. p.171) gives the cave the name of Maṇiguha, and adds that it measured eight usabhas. Another feature is the attempt to give the origins of things. The author of the Dpvs. explains the origin of the names Sīhala and Tambapaṇṇi. The Mhvs. gives in addition the origin of some names of towns, as Mahātittha, as well as how the Pulindā came into existence.

The explanation of the name Tambapaṇṇi is certainly unsatisfactory. The word paṇṇi may be traced to parṇi, but not pāṇi, which is the same in Pāli and Sanskrit. Tamba is the same as Skt. tāmra, which may mean copper or copper-coloured. Tāmra also may mean a plant such as sandal. It is most likely that the name Tambapaṇṇi has some connection with the name of the river Tāmraparṇi in South India.

Mahātittha is identified with Mantota, apposite the island of Mannar. It seems to have been a famous port in ancient Ceylon. The story of the marriage of Vijaya with a princess of Madhurā seems to be late, and does not seem a historical account. Hence the reason for the name cannot be the one given in the Mhvs.

The Pulindā (VII. 68) or hill men are generally identified with the vāddas, who according to the Mhvs. seem to have lived in Malaya or the hill country. The story of their origin as recorded in the Mhvs, cannot be taken seriously. It has been pointed out already that the yakkhas mentioned in connection with the visits of the Buddha do not refer to human beings. According to the Dpvs, they were expelled from Laṅkā to the island of Giri, and therefore this story is a contradiction of the older one. There is also no reason to think that the yakkhas mentioned in connection with Paṇḍukābhaya were not supernatural beings. If it is accepted that the word yakkha there refers to a human being, one must also accept that the vāddas were once a much more civilised people. Dr. Seligmann, in his book on the Vāddas, points out that he cannot agree with this view. They seem to be of the same stock as the Kurumbas, Irulas and some other wild pre-Dravidian tribes of India (Haddon, Races of Man pp.7 13).

The first to confuse the Vāddas with the yakkhas was Fa-hsien, who came to Ceylon at the beginning of the fifth century A.D. Perhaps the story of the origin of the Vāddas was in existence at the time he arrived. Fa-hsien says these

were the original inhabitants. There seems to be hardly any reason to doubt this. Most probably they retreated to the hills on the arrival of the later settlers.

There ~~seems to be~~ is hardly any reason to think that the story of Vijaya and of his ancestry has any historical bearing. The legend ~~seems~~ appears to have grown, as in the case of other names already dealt with, from speculation with regard to the origin of the name Sīhala. The legend itself as we find it in the Dpvs. seems to have been an independent ballad. It begins:

"Laṅkadīpe ayaṃ ahū sīhena Sīhalā iti.

"Dīpuppattiṃ imaṃ vaṃsaṃ sunātha vacanaṃ mama."

("This island of Laṅkā was called Sīhala after the lion. Listen ye to my narrative, this story of the origin of the island.")

The Porānā in ~~its~~ their original form did not deal with kings, and the version of ~~it~~ them as found in the Dpvs, cannot be dated earlier than the first century B.C. It is not likely therefore that this account is older. Ceylon seems to have been known as Tambapaṇṇi in the earliest times, and Sīhala is

a later name. Moreover, according to Hiuen Tsiang and the Dpvs, it is the island that is called Sīhala. Therefore the legend is likely to have grown at a time when the people became well enough known outside the island for the land itself to be called by their name. If the Salike of Ptolemy means Simhale, there is an external record of the name in the second century A.D.

Professor Rapson, (Camb. Hist. of Ind. Vol.I. p.205) dealing with the Purānas, says: "The first glimpses of authentic history only appear when the tribal names are inserted in the genealogies under the disguise of eponymous ancestors. These too are the outcome of hypothesis, but hypothesis founded on facts. All the members of a tribe are presumably descended from a common ancestor, and related tribes are descended from related ancestors. On these supposed individuals the names of the tribes are conferred and they supply a sort of genealogical framework which continues to be filled in by tradition until the age of records. Once fashioned in this way, such genealogies are accepted without question until the period when critical scholarship arises and undertakes its first duty, which is to discriminate between legends and fact in the history of past ages."

This criticism seems to apply to the genealogical list of the Sinhalese kings. Sīhala seems to have been a tribal name, and Sīhabāhu the eponymous ancestor. The genealogical framework seems to have been filled in by tradition till records began to be kept, probably in the first century B.C. or later.

It is, however, still left to explain from where the Sinhalese came. The legends seem to give hardly any clue except that in the early centuries of the Christian era, if not earlier, there was the belief that the Sinhalese came from Western or Eastern India, and that they came from those parts by sea and not through South India.

This theory appeals to people even to-day, as otherwise it is difficult to explain why in Ceylon an Āryan language is spoken, while in South India the people speak Dravidian languages. Researches into the Sinhalese language have not yet gone so far ~~in order~~ as to enable one to come to any conclusion as to which language in India it is most closely allied.

It is difficult to say why the early Sinhalese traced their origin to Lāla in the West or to the region of Vaṅga and Kaliṅga in the East. Perhaps it was due to their attempts to identify Sīhapura rather than to a question of language.

Once they fixed on Sīhapuras which were near the sea-coast and not on the main land routes to the South, it was natural for them to think of sea routes well known at the time.

The oldest form of the legend says that Siṃhala came from South India, but so far no reference to a Siṃhala tribe of South India has been found. It is difficult to believe that in the early days colonists in large numbers came from Eastern or Western India, making such long voyages at a time when conditions for travelling were so unfavourable. There is also no reason to think that peoples who spoke Āryan languages could not have come from South India. There is very early evidence of their penetration to the South. The Āryan names of the rivers Mahānadī, Godāvarī, Kṛishṇā, ~~Kāvēā~~ and Tāmraparṇī are sufficient proof of such a fact. The earliest Sinhalese also settled along the rivers, and there seems to have been some connection between Tinnevelly and Ceylon, because the oldest name of Ceylon is the same as Tāmraparṇī, the river of that region.

Fa-hsien says that merchants were the first to come to Ceylon, and when its attractions became known, others followed in large numbers. The earliest Buddhist accounts about Ceylon deal with visits of merchants to whom the island,

as to the author of the Rāmāyaṇa, was a sort of fairy-land. Thus there is some reason for the statement of Fa-hsien. At the same time it shows that it may not be possible to trace the early settlers in Ceylon to one definite part of India.

## Chapter VIII.

## PAṆḌUVASUDEVA, ABHAYA AND PAṆḌUKĀBHAYA.

## Paṇḍuvasudeva, Abhaya and Paṇḍukābhaya.

It is perhaps best to deal with these three successors of Vijaya together as the legends about them belong to one group. The accounts of them found in the chapters VIII, IX and X are more like fairy-tales than historical accounts and have some features common to the story of Vijaya.

As in the story of Vijaya, the number thirty-two occurs. Bhaddakaccāna comes with thirty-two followers for the thirty-two ministers of Paṇḍuvāsudeva. Paṇḍuvāsudeva comes to Upatissāgāma on the seventh day. Sakka Paṇḍu has seven sons. Bhaddakaccāna is wooed by seven kings. Paṇḍukābhaya occupies the Ariṭṭha mountain for seven years and escapes death for the first time at the age of seven. His second escape is at the age of twelve and he leaves for the house of the brahman Paṇḍula at the age of sixteen. Near the Kāsa mountain he gathered 700 followers, the same number that followed Vijaya to Ceylon. The king of Vaṅga offers a thousand pieces to him who kills the lion and Abhaya offers a thousand pieces to Paṇḍukābhaya to induce him to keep to the land on the other side of the river. Soothsayers assure the success of the journeys of both

Paṇḍuvāsudeva and Bhaddakaccāna and predict that they would be king and queen respectively. Like Vijaya they are both protected by supernatural beings, and again like Vijaya Paṇḍuvāsudeva is not consecrated at first as he lacked a consort, and Bhaddakaccāna is sent away in a ship. The leaves in the hands of Suvaṇṇapāṭi, as in the case of Sīhabāhu, Sīhasīvaṭi and their mother, turn into vessels of gold.

The account in the Dpvs contains none of these embellishments. It is very fragmentary, and perhaps the verses served only to help those who narrated the story. Therefore little can be learnt from them with regard to the original form of the stories. According to the Dpvs Vijaya before his death sent a message to his brother Sumitta asking ~~one of them~~ some member of the family to come in order to succeed him as ruler of Laṅkā. The daughter of Sakka Paṇḍu, Kaccāna, came from Jambudīpa to preserve the dynasty. She was consecrated as the queen consort of Paṇḍuvāsa who had arrived in Upatissagāma the same year. Paṇḍuvāsa ruled for 30 years and was succeeded by his eldest son Abhaya. Abhaya had nine brothers, Tissa, Utti, Tissa, Asela, Vibhāta, Rāma, Siva, Matta, and Mattakāla and one sister, Cittā, who was called Ummādacittā because she excited the passions of people. The seven Sākiya princes, the

grandchildren of Amitodana, who were sprung from the line of the leader of the world were Rāma, Tissa, Anurādha, Mahāli, Dīghāvu, Rohiṇī and Gāmaṇī.

Gāmaṇī, the son of Dīghāvu had intercourse with the princess Cittā, and from this union Paṇḍuka was born. Paṇḍuka, saving his life resided at Dovārikamaṇḍala. When Abhaya had ruled for twenty years, Paṇḍuka was also twenty years old. For seventeen years after that he lived as a robber. Then he put to death seven of his maternal uncles and received the royal coronation at Anurādhapura. After he had ruled for ten years he established the boundaries of the villages and gave security completely. He enjoyed sovereignty over men and yakkhas and reigned for seventy years.

This narrative not merely lacks the embellishments of the Mhvs account but also ~~does not~~ makes ~~any~~ no reference to some of the episodes. For instance as in the case of Vijaya there is no reference to the marriage of Paṇḍukābhaya. In some matters there is also disagreement. The Mhvs says that Vijaya sent a letter to Sumitta asking him to succeed him, but he did not come, as he had already succeeded Sīhabāhu and that his youngest son Paṇḍuvāsudeva offered to come. According to the Mhvs eight uncles were killed, but the Dpvs mentions only seven. Again the

Mhvs is more definite when it says that Paṇḍukābhaya established the village boundaries of the whole island of Laṅkā. There is disagreement even in the list of the Sākiya princes. The Dpvs has Mahāli and Gāmiṇi instead of Uruvela and Vijita, and Paṇḍukābhaya is only known as Paṇḍuka or Pakuṇḍaka.

The story of Paṇḍuvāsudeva and Paṇḍukābhaya shows the influence of the Ghata Jātaka (454). According to it King Mahākaṃsa ruled in Uttarāpatha in the Kaṃsa district in Asitañjana. He had two sons, Kaṃsa and Upakaṃsa, and one daughter named Devagabbhā. On her birthday it was foretold by the brahmans that a son born of her would one day destroy the country and the lineage of Kaṃsa. After the death of Mahākaṃsa, his sons wished to kill their sister, but as such an act would raise an outcry against them they resolved to give her in marriage to none, and, having caused a building to be erected on one pillar, they made her lodge there. She had a serving woman called Nandagopā and her husband Andhakaveṇhu watched her. Upasāgara, the brother of King Sāgara of Upper Madhurā, intrigued in his brother's zenana, and when detected ran away to Upakaṃsa, who was his friend. Then he was introduced to King Kaṃsa and the latter had him in great honour. Upasāgara once observed the tower where Devagabbhā dwelt. He made inquiries and when he heard the story he fell in love with her. Devagabbhā too

one day saw him while he went with Upakaṃsa, the vice-regent, to wait upon the king. She inquired who he was from Nandagopā and found out everything about him. She too fell in love with him. Upasāgara gave Nandagopā a present and asked her to arrange a meeting with Devagabbhā. This she did easily as Devagabbhā was already in love with him. Thus Nandagopā one night brought Upasāgara up into the tower and he spent the time with Devagabbhā. By their constant intercourse Devagabbhā conceived. When it became known that she was with child the brothers questioned Nandagopā, and when they heard the story they thought: "We cannot put our sister to death. If she bears a daughter we will spare the babe, if a son we will kill him." And they gave Devagabbhā to Upasagara to wife.

When her full time came a daughter was born to her and she was called Añjanadevī by the brothers, who also allotted her parents the village Govaddhamāna, where they abode. Devagabbhā's next child was a son, but since on the same day a daughter was born to Nandagopā the children were exchanged. Nine other sons were born to Devagabbhā and since to Nandagopā were born nine daughters, they too were exchanged secretly. The sons of Devagabbhā were called Vāsudeva, Bāladeva, Candadeva, Sūriyadeva, Aggideva, Varuṇadeva, Ajjuna, Pajjuna, Ghata and Aṅkura.

These sons when they grew up, being strong and ferocious went about plundering. The people complained three times and the king each time rebuked Andhakaveṇhu and finally threatened him. Then Andhakaveṇhu revealed the secret that they were not his children.

These ten sons later killed their uncles and assumed the sovereignty and then proceeded to conquer the whole of India. They first captured Ayojjhā, and then proceeded to Dvāravatī. Now the city had the sea on one side and on the other the mountains. It could not be captured as whenever enemies approached a yakkha who kept watch took the form of an ass and brayed. Then the whole city rose in the air and deposited itself on an island in the middle of the sea. When the enemy were gone it returned. But following the advice of the ass the ten brothers succeeded in capturing the city. After this they conquered the whole of India and lived at Dvāravatī, dividing the kingdom into ten shares.

The Jātaka resembles the Mhvs account too closely for the similarities to be accidental. The story of Cittā and Dīghagāmiṇi, the prophecy of the brahmans, the nature of the building in which Cittā was lodged, the part played by the female attendant, the exchange of children, the names Vāsudeva and Dvāramaṇḍala , the ten sons, the acts of plundering, the yakkhiṇī who takes the

form of a mare instead of the ass, are all reminiscent of the Jātaka. The fixing of the boundaries on the tenth year reminds one of the partition of the kingdom into ten divisions.

The Jātaka itself can be traced to the Krishṇa legends. The names in the Jātaka seem to have got mixed up in course of time. According to the Harivaṁśa, Krishṇa or Vāsudeva was not the eldest of the sons but the eighth, and Rāma was the seventh, Kaṁsa is the son of Ugrasena and Devakī is the wife of Vasudeva. In some accounts Devakī is the sister of Kaṁsa. Vāsudeva or Krishṇa married Rukmini and had ten sons. They resided at Dvāravatī.

It is clear from the Mhvs account that other Krishṇa legends were also known in Ceylon. The attempt of the uncles to kill Paṇḍukābhaya by killing all the young children of the place and later by killing the shepherds are also reminiscent of Krishṇa. Kaṁsa ordered the killing of all children who did wonderful deeds in order that Krishṇa might be killed and it is also said that Krishṇa along with his brother Rāma lived with the herdsmen to escape being killed by Kaṁsa.

The story of Sumitta's marriage with a daughter of the Madda king may have been the result of the influence of the Jātakas. According to Kaliṅga-Bodhi Jātaka, Prince Kaliṅga married the daughter of the Madda king. In the Kusa Jātaka (531) the ministers go in search of a wife for Prince Kusa, to Sagāla in the kingdom

of Madda. But it is possible that this again shows the influence of the Mahābhārata stories , where Paṇḍu's second wife is Mādrī, sister of Śalya, king of the Madras.

Similarly the education of a prince (X.20) along with the son of a brahman, who is later made the purohita, is a feature of the Jātakas (183 and 422), but it is also mentioned that two brahmans Kṛpa and Droṇa were the tutors of the Paṇḍu princes and that one of Droṇa's sons studied with them.

The Dpvs account, apart from names and years hardly goes beyond the details of the Jātaka, and perhaps the story originally was closer to it. It is also significant that in the Dpvs Paṇḍukābhaya is only called Paṇḍuka, which may mean one of the Paṇḍus and may equally apply to Krishṇa. Krishṇa's father was Vasudeva and Paṇḍukābhaya's grandfather was Paṇḍuvāsudeva. The account of Paṇḍukābhaya's campaign seems to have been influenced by the Mahājanaka Jātaka (539). According to it Ariṭṭhajanaka heard that his brother Polajanaka intended killing him. Polajanaka then went to a frontier village and took up his abode there, and the king was not able to get him arrested. After he became master of the frontier district and had a large following he went to Mithilā and encamped in the outskirts of the city. Then most of the inhabitants of Mithilā and other towns joined him.

There are also other reasons to think that this Jātaka

had its influence. According to it the queen, who was with child, put her treasures in a basket, and escaped. On her way Sakka meets her and takes her in a carriage. Inside the carriage she finds a cloak which she was to put on and a cake (pūva) which she was to eat.

This is reminiscent of the story of the serving woman who took Paṇḍukābhaya in a basket and when she was questioned by the uncles, said that she had in it a cake for her daughter. The names of Dīghāvu and Sīvali occurring in the Jātaka are those of a Sākiya prince and a daughter of Muṭasiva respectively.

The Dpvs does not mention any of the places in which battles were fought or those which Paṇḍukābhaya occupied. The only place it mentions is Dovārikaniaṇḍala, which corresponds to Dvāravatī in the Ghata Jātaka. Even in the Mhvs the main part of the fighting takes place near the river and the Dhūmarakkha mountain, and here the story resembles the Jātaka, where the city to be captured lies between the mountain and the sea. Professor Geiger points out the similarity between the route taken by Paṇḍukābhaya and that taken according to tradition by Duṭṭhāgamiṇi, and it is possible that this account has been influenced also by the traditions connected with Duṭṭhagamiṇi.

The story of Cetiyā has been dealt with elsewhere, but the introduction of Cittanāja and Kāḷavela into the story and the change of the ass into a mare may have had as its original cause the

existence of religious cults. In Mhvs XXXVII.44 it is said that King Mahāsena built a thūpa at the place of the yakkha Kāḷavela. This seems to suggest that there was a shrine at this place. Probably there was an image too as he is said to have been visible. Similarly there was perhaps a shrine for Cittanāja at the lower end of the Abhaya tank. Unless there was also an image of him, it is difficult to understand how Paṇḍukābhaya would have sat beside him on a seat of equal height. Assamukhī seems to have been worshipped in North India and there appears to have been a shrine for her within the royal precincts. These and the yakkhiṇī, whose shrine was at the south gate of the city seem to have been connected later with the story of Paṇḍukābhaya.

The Dpvs account of the sending of the message to Sumitta does not occur in the account of Paṇḍuvāsa as in the Mhvs but is added to the chapter on Vijaya after some chronological details. It is possible that this came to be added later in order to connect Paṇḍuvāsudeva with the line of Vijaya (VIII.3).

There is no record of Sakka Amitodana (VIII.18) anywhere in the Pāli Canon, but he is mentioned in the Pāli commentaries, the Tibetan Dulva, and the Mahāvastu. According to the Cullavagga VII.I. Mahānāma and Anuruddha were the only sons. According to Dha IV. 124 they were the sons of Amitodana. According to Ang. Com. p.292 Ānanda is also a son of Amitodana. Even if Amitodana is a historical person it is clear that one cannot rely on these relationships, as they seem to be later inventions. There is no

reference to a son of his called Paṇḍu, and the Mhvs account does not seem to be historical.

The destruction of the Sakiyas referred to here is, as the M Ṭ points out, similar to that of Viḍūḍabha. The story is related in Jātaka 465 where it is said that King Viḍūḍabha slew all the Sākiyas, beginning with the babes at the breast. The DhA I. 359 uses almost the same phrases, but contradicts the Jātaka by saying that some escaped and the rest were killed. The Jātaka account does not agree also with the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta, where the Sākiyas claim a share of the relics. If the Jātaka account is the earliest, the change in the Commentary may be explained as an attempt to get over the difficulty created by the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta.

It is difficult to say what truth there is in these accounts, but it is clear how unreliable ~~they are to come to~~ for any conclusion as to the historicity of Sākiya Paṇḍu. According to M Ṭ p.119 Chandragupta, the grandfather of Asoka, is also descended from the Sākiyas who escaped the massacre of Viḍūḍabha. Perhaps the story of Bhaddakaccāna was invented to glorify the Ceylon kings by connecting them with the family of the Buddha.

The seven sons of Sākiya Paṇḍu are mentioned in the Dpvs in a memorial couplet, just as the sons of Paṇḍuvāsa and Muṭasiva are given. Of these names Tissa does not occur in the Mhvs and may

be identified with the son who did not come to Ceylon. Tissa is also the name of the second sons of Panduvāsa and Muṭasiva. In the Mhvs Asoka's younger brother is also called Tissa, while in Indian legends he is called Vītasoka. Another name that does not occur is Mahāli. In Jātaka 465 which has influenced the story of Sākiya Paṇḍu, the name of Mahāli appears as the blind counsellor. The Mhvs ~~also~~ has not also the name Gāmiṇi. The name of Dīghāvu appears in more than one Jātaka. In the Mahājanaka Jātaka, which seems to have influenced the story of Paṇḍukābhaya, Dīghāvu is the son of Queen Sīvalī, the name of Vijaya's sister and of Muṭasiva's daughter. The name of Rohaṇa is perhaps due to the influence of the Ghata Jātaka (454) where the name Rohiṇeyya occurs. Rāma in the Kṛishṇa legends is the name of the brother of Kṛishṇa.

Instead of the names Mahāli and Gāmiṇi, Uruvela and Vijita are given in the Mhvs, and all the six sons are referred to as founders of villages. This legend probably came into existence as some of the names of villages were similar to those of the princes.

The Sākiyan Princes.

| Dpvs X. 6. | Mhvs IX. 9. |
|---|---|
| Rāma | Rāma (Ramagoṇa) |
| Tissa | Uruvela (Uruvelā) |
| Anurādha | Anurādha (Anuradhagāma) |
| Mahāli | Vijita (Vijitāgāma) |
| Dīghāvu | Dīghāyu (Dīghāyu) |
| Rohiṇī | Rohaṇa (Rohaṇa) |
| Gāmaṇī | ~~Rohaṇa~~ |

## The Companions of Vijaya.

| Dpvs Ix.32. | Mhvs VII. 43. |
|---|---|
| Vijita (Vijita and Uruvelā) | Anurādha (Anurādhagāma) |
| Anurādha (Anurādhapura) | Upatissa (Upatissagāma) |
| Accutagāmi (Ujjenī) | Uruvela (Uruvelā) |
| Upatissa (Upatissanagara) | Vijitā (Vijitā) |
| | Ujjeni (Ujjenī) |

The names of the companions of Vijaya too seem to have been derived from names of villages. In the Dpvs the list seems to have been a later addition to the story of Vijaya, and perhaps the account is even later than the tradition recorded in the Mhvs, as the forms Anurādhapura and Upatissanagara are given. But the names of the companions are mentioned as in the Mhvs definitely in connection with the foundation of villages. The names of the villages in the two lists agree but not the names of the founders. This seems to suggest that the names of the villages existed first and the attempts to explain their origin were later. Uruvelā and Vijitā occur in all the three lists. It is probable that some tried to attribute the foundation of these two places to the companions of Vijaya while others made two Sākiya princes founders of them. In the Mhvs there are other references to Anurādha, Upatissāgāma, Uruvelā, Vijitā, Rāmagoṇa and Rohoṇa. Dīghāvāpi is mentioned both in the Dpvs and in the Mhvs, but it is difficult to say whether it has any connection with Dīghāyu. There is also no other reference to Ujjenī. Ujjenī in India was an important centre of Theravāda

Buddhism and lay on the route to Ceylon. Perhaps this name and that of Uruvelā show the influence of Buddhism.

According to the Mhvs Paṇḍuvāsudeva had ten sons and one daughter. Of these only the names of three sons, Abhaya, Tissa and Siva, and of the daughter Cittā are given. Of the sons of Muṭasiva Mhvs gives only Tissa, Mahānāga, Uttiya, Mattābhaya, Asela and Sūratissa. The Dpvs, on the other hand, gives complete lists:

| Paṇḍuvāsa's children. X. 3. | Muṭasiva's children. XI. 6 and XVII. 75. |
|---|---|
| Abhaya | Abhaya |
| Tissa | Tissa |
| Utti | Nāga |
| Tissa | Utti |
| Asela, the fifth | Mattābhaya |
| Vibhāta | Mitta |
| Rāma | Siva |
| Siva | Asela |
| Matta | Tissa |
| Mattakala | Kira |
| - | - |
| Cittā | Anula |
| | Sīvala |

It is striking that both Paṇḍuvāsa and Muṭasiva had each ten sons only, a number common in folklore. In both lists as well as in the lists of the Sākiya princes Tissa comes second. Asela is said

definitely to be the fifth son of Paṇḍuvāsa, while Asela, the son of Muṭasiva, was the fifth son to rule. Tissa, the second son of Sākiya Paṇḍu, remains in India, probably to succeed his father and Devānaṃpiya Tissa, the second son, succeeds Muṭasiva. The names of the two lists are very similar. Seven names are the same. Instead of Vibhāta, Rāma and Mattakāla, the names Nāga, Mitta and Kira appear among the sons of Muṭasiva. According to Ghata Jātaka, which undoubtedly has had a strong influence on the story of Paṇḍukābhaya, Upasāgara, like Paṇḍuvāsudeva, had ten sons and one daughter. Paṇḍukābhaya is said to have reigned for seventy years and thus died at the age of one hundred and seven. Muṭasiva ~~who~~ must have been fairly old when he began to reign. He was a son of Paṇḍukābhaya by Suvaṇṇapālī, whom Pandukābhaya married at about the age of sixteen. Then five of his sons succeed him who together reign for ninety years, and the last is preceded by two Damiḷas who rule twelve years. Paṇḍuvāsudeva rules for thirty years, Abhaya for twenty years, Paṇḍukābhaya for seventy years, Muṭasiva for sixty years, Devānaṃpiya Tissa for forty years and each of his brothers for ten years ( 30+70+60+40+10+10+10+10) Asela, the youngest brother of Devānaṃpiya Tissa, was succeeded by Ēlāra who was a contemporary of Kākavaṇṇa Tissa, the great-grandson of Devānaṃpiya Tissa's brother Mahānāga.

The artificiality of these two lists is quite clear, and

perhaps the first has been influenced by the second or one by the other. It is possible that the list of the sons of Paṇḍuvāsa is a mere invention and has no historical value.

The sons of Muṭasiva, however, cannot be dismissed in the sam way . According to the Naval Nirāvi Malei Inscription , Abi Anuradi, the wife of King Uti and daughter of King Nāga and King Uti, caused a cave to be made for the saṃgha. It is clear from this that in the time of King Uttiya there was Buddhism in Ceylon and therefore it is most likely that Buddhism first came to Ceylon in the time of Devānaṃpiya Tissa, his predecessor, who according to Ceylon tradition was a contemporary of Asoka. Hence one may take for granted that there is some tradition which may be considered historical from his time.

Naga appears also in the Dpvs list as a brother of Tissa, but according to the inscription Uttiya married his daughter. There is no evidence of the practice of the marrying of nieces at this time and since the list of kings seems so artificial one may justly ~~rightly~~ doubt whether the five kings and Nāga were actually brothers. Even if the impossible dates are rejected as later additions it is clear from the inscription that Nāga must have been a contemporary of Devānaṃpiya Tissa, and therefore King Ēlāra, the successor of his youngest brother Asela, could not have been the contemporary of Mahānāga's great-grandson Kākavaṇṇa Tissa, whose son defeats him.

Nāga plays no important part in the Dpvs, and according to it there is no reason to think that Anulā is not the wife of Devānaṃpiya Tissa. In the ~~Mahāvaṃsa~~ Mhvs, however, Nāga is called Mahānāga and made the husband of Queen Anulā, who became a bhikkhunī. It is probable that Nāga is made a son of Muṭasiva and Anula is made his wife in order to glorify Duṭṭhāgāmiṇi by connecting the Rohaṇa kings with the royal line of Vijaya and with the beginnings of Buddhism in Ceylon. If the succession of the Rohaṇa kings is correct, it is possible that the successors of Muṭasiva were made his sons by later tradition which also added other names to make up the number of ten.

The strange piece of information that the deposed king, Abhaya, was ~~handed over~~ entrusted with the government for the night and thus became the nāgaraguttika is not easy to explain. The only reference to such an incident is found in a Jātaka. In the Chavaka Jātaka (309) a king who wants to reward a caṇḍāla says: "Friend, had you been of a high caste family I would have made you sole king. But henceforth I will be king by day and you shall be king by night." And with these words he placed upon his neck the wreath of flowers with which he himself was adorned and made him a nāgaraguttika. To this is traced the custom of a nāgaraguttika wearing a wreath of flowers.

This, however, does not explain why King Abhaya should be given

a post which is given to a caṇḍāla in the Jātaka. Perhaps the caṇḍālas traced their ancestry to King Abhaya and this passage records such a tradition!

The account of Anurādhapura as having been laid out by Paṇḍukābhaya is found only in the Mhvs. The Dpvs makes no mention of it, and the only detail found there is a reference to the dwelling of the nigaṇṭha Giri, who, according to the Mhvs lived in the time of King Vaṭṭagāmaṇi.

No satisfactory explanation has yet been offered with regard to the queens of the west. Prof.Geiger (Mahāvamsa p.LIV) says:"The name pacchimarājinī seems to mean western queens; it is used for the name of the chapel or sanctuary of those goddesses. I think it is not mere accident that the sanctuary of the pacchimarājinī was built pacchimadvāradisābhāge. We do not know anything,however, about the character of those western queens. They were perhaps death goddesses."

The banyan tree of Vessavaṇa (skt Vaiśravana or Kuvera, the god of wealth) and the palmyra palm of the demon of maladies or of the god of huntsmen refer most probably to two trees that were worshipped. According to Mahāvagga V.7 of the Vinaya Piṭaka, when the Chabaggiya bhikkhus broke off young palmyra palms and the people complained, the Buddha is said to have rebuked them for their act and remarked that people believed that life dwelt in a tree.

Mahejāgaram is translated as the house of the Great Sacrifice, by Prof.Geiger. It is referred to again in XVII.30 in connection

with the foundation of the Thūpārāma cetiya. The royal elephant bearing the relic is said to have entered the city by the east gate, come out of it by the South gate, and proceeded as far as this shrine set up to the west of the spot where the cetiya of the Thūpārāma stood. According to M Ṭ (p.269) Maheja is the name of a yakkha. The Smp has Pabheja and Pabheci instead of Maheja.

Yona (skt Yavana) till the second century A.D. meant a Greek or a person of Greek origin, but later it meant a foreigner (Rapson's Ancient India p.86). E.H.Warmington (The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India, p.117) is of the opinion that the Greeks and the Romans did not trade directly with Ceylon till the monsoons began to be utilised for purposes of travelling, but that before the second century A.D. the articles from Ceylon were conveyed to South India from where they were conveyed to Greece and Italy by Greek and Roman merchants. If Beal's translation of Fa-hsien's travels is correct, there were at the beginning of the fifth century A.D. houses of Sabaean (Arabian) merchants in Anurādhapura. If the merchants referred to are Greek or Roman, the settlement is not likely to have been older than the second century A.D. If they were Arabian they were not likely to have been called Yonas before the same time.

It is not possible to say when the brahmans first came to Ceylon. The Dpvs does not refer to them either in connection with

Vijaya or Paṇḍukābhaya, and the reference to the brahman Paranatapabbata in the reign of Devānampiya Tissa occurs in an interpolated line.

The niganthas(skt nirgrantha) are the Jains, the followers of Mahāvīra. It is said (Camb.History of India p.165) that when a dreadful famine occurred in the time of Chandragupta a section of the Jains took up their abode in Karnāṭa (Mysore) in southern India, but that they returned afterwards. It is not easy to judge whether this migration is a historical fact. Even if it were, there is no evidence as to when they first came to Ceylon.

The Ājīvakas were another religious sect founded by Makkhali Gosāla, who is said to have been a contemporary of the Buddha. Paribbājakas were wandering ascetics, and a samaṇa meant a member of a religious order which was not brahmanical.

It is clear from the reference to the nigaṇṭha Giri that this account of Anurādhapura is not older than the first century B.C. and the mention of a settlement of the Yonas suggests that it may even be a description of Anurādhapura, as it was in the second century A.D. or later. The only places mentioned in the Dpvs are Upatissāgāma, Dovārikamaṇḍala and Anurādhapura. The Mhvs refers to quite a number of other places ~~too~~ besides those mentioned earlier. According to the Mhvs Anurādhapura was founded near the village of Anurādhagāma but the M Ṭ (p.204) says that according to the Aṭṭhakathā the city was built even in that village.

Dvāramaṇḍala is mentioned again in XVII.59 and XXIII.23. It was situated near the Cetiyapabbata (Mihintale).

The Mahākandra river has not yet been identified. Prof.Geiger thinks it may be one of the rivers falling into the sea north of Mannar. The port of Gonagāmaka was probably at its mouth.

The Kāsa mountain near which was Paṇa is identified by Prof. Geiger with Kahagalagam, ten miles north of Kaluvāva and fifteen miles south-east of Anurādhapura,and ten miles away from Riṭigala. The Kāsa mountain is also mentioned in XXV. 20.

Prof.Geiger identifies Kalahanagara with Kalahagala, which lies to the south of Mineri-tank, not far from the left bank of the Ambangaṅga,which flows into the Mahāvāliganga lower down.

Lohitavāhakhaṇḍa has not yet been identified. The Dhūmarakkha mountain was on the left bank of the Mahāvāliganga not far from the Kacchaka ford. According to M Ṭ p.201 it was the Udumbara mountain. Tumbariyangaṇa was a lake near it.

Ariṭṭhapabbata is Riṭigala,to the north of Habarana. Labugāmaka may be the present Labunoruwa (pāli lābunagaraka),lying to the north-west of the Riṭigala. Girikaṇḍa is the name of a district. In Mhvs XXIII.49 and 68 a district called Giri is mentioned. Doḷapabbata was on the eastern bank of Mahāvāliganga. Kacchakatitta according to Prof.Geiger is the present Māgantota,a ford below the place where Ambaṅganga and Mahāvāliganga join.

In these chapters too there are attempts to give the origins

of names. Senāpatigumbaka was so called because the commander of the army of Paṇḍukābhaya's uncles, when defeated, escaped and fled to this thicket. When Paṇḍukābhaya saw the heap of skulls he said: " 'Tis like a heap of gourds", and the place was therefore called Lābugāmaka. Kalahanagara was so called because a battle took place there between Pandukābhaya and the followers of his uncle Siva. Lohitavāhakaṇḍa was so called probably because Caṇḍa slew here the five sons of Siva. Anurādhapura was so called because it was the dwelling of place of two Anurādhas and because it was founded under the constellation of Anurādha. According to the Dpvs it is Anurādha the companion of Vijaya, who had the name of the constellation. It is not likely that Anurādhapura was given that name for all the three reasons. They appear to be three attemps to explain the origin of the name. The explanations of the other names too seem to be no more than similar attempts to explain the origin of names that already existed

Thus apart from names of places and shrines there seems to be hardly any history in the stories connection with Paṇḍuvāsudeva and Paṇḍukābhaya. It is probably the existence of the village called Dvāramaṇḍala that led to the Jātaka story being connected with Ceylon. Then the legend seems to have gradually grown and other places seem to have been included in it, as in the case of the story of Vijaya.

# Chapter IX.

## MAHINDA AND DEVĀNAṂPIYA TISSA.

## Mahinda and Devānampiya Tissa.

Asoka's relations with Mahinda and Devānampiya Tissa have been dealt with partly in the chapter on Asoka. The story of Mahinda's entry into the capital is given in chapter XIV of the Mhvs. His acceptance of the Mahāvihāra and the Cetiyapabbata vihāra are recorded in chapters XV and XVI. The story of the bringing of the relics is in chapter XVII. Chapters XVIII and XIX give the story of the bringing of the Bodhi-tree. The account of the deaths and funerals of Mahinda and Saṃghamittā are recorded in chapter XX.

The Smp accounts of the entry of Mahinda into Anurādhapura, of his acceptance of the Mahāvihāra and of the Cetiyapabbata vihāra, of the arrival of the relics, and of the receiving and coming of the Bodh-tree are in many respects similar to those of the Mhvs. The order of events, however, is often different and the Mhvs gives as usual more information.

In the Mhvs (XIV. 3) the deva is said to have taken the form of a gokaṇṇa, but the Smp uses the word rohitamiga, which is found in the Jātakas. The Smp also uses the form devatā where the Mhvs has deva.

The Smp also does not say that the king allayed his fears about the theras through a conversation with Bhaṇḍuka (XIV. 31).

Nor is there any reference to the actual conferring of the pabbajjā on Bhaṇḍuka or his reaching arahantship. The Smp also does not mention that the king was taking his food by the rock-basin at the Nāgacatukka when he heard the people summoned to hear ~~his~~ the preaching (XIV. 36) The reason for building a pavilion (XIV.47) is also not given, and Anutā is not referred to as the wife of Mahānāga in this connection.

According to the Smp the first sermon delivered in the Nandana garden was on the Āsivisopama sutta and not on the Bālapaṇḍita suttanta (Mhvs XV. 4). There is no mention of the Nivatta cetiya (XV.10) near the Kadamba river, which was built where Mahinda turned back to go to the Meghavana. The reference to the Meghavana in the Smp (p.81) may be a later addition. The Smp makes no reference to Anutā wanting to be a bhikkhuṇi before the acceptance of the Mahāmeghavana (XV.18), but mentions it in the more natural place in the account of the Bodhi-tree. It also does not mention the predictions made by Mahinda with reference to the Mahāvihāra or his accounts of the visits of the Buddhas (XV.24). The predictions with regard to the uposathāgāra, the place of meeting called Ambangaṇa, and the Mahācetiya are recorded in p.101 after the account of the Bodhi-tree. The Smp, however, says that the prediction about the uposathāgāra was made in the place of the Lohapāsāda, and not, as in the Mhvs (XV.36), on the spot of the Mahāmucalamālaka. The Mhvs calls Ambangaṇa Pambamālaka, and also

mentions that a tree grew immediately. The Smp also does not trace the descent of Duṭṭhagāmini from Mahānāga (Mhvs XV. 169). The visits of the Buddha are mentioned in connection with the building of the Thūpārāma cetiya (Smp.p.98). Here The Mahāmeghavana is not mentioned but the names of Thūpārāma and of Cetiyapabbata in the times of the previous Buddhas are given. Each of the Buddhas ~~are~~ also said to have converted eighty-four thousand persons.

The second sermon preached at the Nandana garden was on the Anamataggiya and the third was on the Aggikkhandopamā. The subjects of the sermons on the next three days and the retirement to Tissārāma on the third and the subsequent days are not mentioned in the Smp. The Mahappamāda sutta was preached on the seventh day and not on the twenty-sixth day as in the Mhvs XVI. 3. The Smp also makes no mention of the name Tissārāma, the marking of its boundaries on the fourth day, and the building of the Kālāpāsāda parivena and the other buildings in the Tissārāma.

In the account of the acceptance of the Cetiyapabbata vihara the Smp does not mention that the theras bathed in the Nāgacatukka tank, that the work of the rock-cells was finished on the full-moon day of Āsāḷha, and that the boundaries of the thirty-two mālakas were established; but it says that Mahinda converted the royal family of ten brothers.

In the story of the relics the Smp does not say that Asoka was to be asked also for the alms-bowl (XVII. 12). It does not mention

that Sumana met Dhammāsoka even as the latter stood at the foot of the sāla tree and honoured the beautiful and sacred Bodhi-tree with the offerings of the Kattika festival, and that he went to the Himālaya and placed the bowl of relics there before he went to meet Sakka. The name of the cetiya from where Sakka took out the right collar-bone is called Maṇicetiya and not Cūlamaṇi cetiya (XVII.20). The position in which Sumana met Dhammāsoka is given in Smp,p.96 in the account of the Bodhi-tree, but this may be a later addition.

The Smp also does not say that the Cetiyagiri mountain was so called because the Thera put down the relics there (XVII.23). The prince who is converted by the twin-miracle is called Abhaya (Mhvs XVII. 57). There is no mention of Mahinda living in the Mahāmegha-grove during the building of the thupa (XVII.39) or the young men receiving the pabbajjā from Vihārabīja, Gallakapīṭha and from Upatissagāma (XVII.59). On the other hand it mentions that when the relic was placed on the elephant a great cloud arose and rained a shower of lotuses, and that the thūpa was made in the shape of a heap of paddy. It also adds that after the dhātupūjā was completed Mahinda went to Meghavana and dwelt there. The Smp also does not mention the building of the Thūpārāma vihāra.

The Smp refers only to the prophecy of the Buddha with regard to the twin-miracle. The five prophecies (XVII.47) are given in the account of the Bodhi-tree (p.92). The Hemamālika cetiya

(XVII.52) is there called the Mahācetiya.

In the account of the Bodhi-tree the Smp does not give the name of the vihāra where Anutā resided (XVIII.12). Nor does it say that the vase in radiance was like the morning sun (XVIII.28). The width of the space covered by Asoka's party was one yojana and not three (XVIII.29). Nine other lines were drawn round the Bodhi-branch and not ten (XVIII.43). The Mhvs, however, in XVIII. 47 refers to a hundred roots and not to one hundred and ten.

Among the persons appointed to watch over the Bodhi-tree (XIX.1.) the Smp does not mention weavers and potters and persons from all handicrafts, nāgas, and yakkhas. It has kuṭumbika (householder) instead of seṭṭhi (merchant.). It also does not give the number of bhikkhuṇīs that accompanied Saṃghamittā (XIX.5.). Nor does it mention that the persons appointed to guard the Bodhi-tree had to escort the Bodhi-tree to the ship. Samuddapaṇṇasālā (XIX.27) is called Samuddasālā. Tissa saw the coming of the Bodhi-tree by the power of the Thera and not of Saṃghamittā (XIX.26). The Smp does not mention a pavilion built on the shore. According to the Mhvs the Bodhi-tree was placed in a car on the tenth day (XIX.33) and was removed to the ~~spot~~ place of the eastern vihāra. The Smp says that on the 4th, the Mahābodhi was removed and it reached Anurādhapura on the 14th.day.

Further the Smp does not mention that the king ordered

a morning meal for the people and the saṃgha (XIX.35) or that Mahinda narrated the story of the subduing of the nāgas by the Buddha. There is also no mention that the king ordered monuments (XIX.36) to be made in places visited by the Buddha, that the Bodhi-tree was set down at the entrance to the village of the brahman Tivakka, or that the nobles of Kājaragāma and of Candanagāma and the brahman Tivakka attended the festival of the Bodhi-tree (XIX.54). With reference to the receiving of the pabbajjā by Anulā the Smp says that along with her five hundred maidens, five hundred women of the harem and one thousand women received the pabbajjā. The Smp also does not refer to the statements made in the Mhvs XIX from gāthā sixty-seven.

In the account of the entry of Mahinda into Anurādhapura the Dpvs like the Mhvs says the deva took the form of a gokaṇṇa. It, however, does not refer, as the Smp does, to Ambatthala, the question about the kinsmen, the bringing of the food of the king and his eating it, the invitation to Bhaṇḍuka, and the preaching of the Samacitta Suttanta after the departure of the king; but it mentions, like the Mhvs, the marking of the boundaries and the conferring of the pabbajjā on Bhaṇḍuka.

The Dpvs also does not refer to the Paṭhama Cetiya or to the place where Mahinda and the others descended, but it says, like the Mhvs, that the pavilion was built as the females of the royal household wanted to see the Thera. According to the Dpvs Mahinda

proclaimed also the Four Truths after he preached the Devadūta Suttanta.

According to the Dpvs the first sermon preached in the Nandana garden was on the Bālapaṇḍita Suttanta. The Dpvs also refers to the building of the Tissārāma, and mentions the predictions about the places of the mālaka, the bathing-house and tank, the Bodhi-tree, the Vihāra, the hall for the distribution of gifts, and the thūpa, but it does not mention the name of the place where the gifts were to be distributed. The Dpvs like the Smp does not refer to the visits of the Buddha in this connection. The second sermon was on the Aggikkhandha Suttanta and the third was on the Āsivisopama Suttanta. After this the boundaries of the Tissārāma are established and the Dpvs also gives an account of the fixing of the boundaries. On the following days he preached the Āsivisopama Suttanta, the Anamataggiya Suttanta, the Cariyāpiṭaka, the Gomayapiṇḍovāda, and the Dhammacakkappavattana. Nearly a month after he preached the Mahāsamaya Suttanta and went to the Missaka Mountain.

In the account of the Cetiyapabbata Vihāra the Dpvs like the Mhvs says that Mahinda and his companions bathed in the Nāgacatukka pond before the king arrived and gives the conversation about the observance of the Vassa. Like the Mhvs it refers to the fixing of the boundaries and the number of enclosures in the different ārāmas. The Dpvs, however, does not mention that the king caused the work to be established in sixty-eight caves near the Kaṇṭaka cetiya.

The companions of Mahāriṭṭha were not his elder and younger brothers but illustrious noblemen,

The account of the bringing of the relics in the Dpvs which formed a part of the ~~Porāṇā~~ oldest verses is similar to that in the Smp. The only additional details are the positions of the towns during the visits of the previous Buddhas, but these seem to be later interpolations. The Dpvs, however, does not mention that Mahinda asked Sumana to go to Sakka and tell him to give the collar-bone and retain the right tooth, that the king received the relic in the Mahānāga garden, that the elephant went to the place called Pabhedavatthu. The Dpvs also does not mention the king's wish about the relic and its fulfilment. It merely makes mention of the visits of the previous Buddhas here and gives the detailed account later. The Dpvs also does not refer to the clearing of the place of the thūpa, the elephant's refusal to allow the relic to be taken down, the obtaining of the clay from the Abhaya tank, the details about the building of the thūpa and the elephant's activities during that time, the twin-miracle, the three visits of Gotamo Buddha and the conversion of Abhaya and the young men from Cetaligāma and Dvāramaṇḍala.

In the account of the Anuṭā the Dpvs makes no reference to a request for the Bodhi-tree or to a condition made by Ariṭṭha or to the five hundred women of the harem.

In the story of Ariṭṭha's visit to Asoka the Dpvs says that

Ariṭṭha crossed the Vindhya mountains and then went to Pāṭaliputta. Sumana is said to be Saṃghamittā's sister's son. Here too there is no reference to the Bodhi-tree or to the five hundred women of the harem.

The coming of the Bodhi-tree was a part of the ~~Porāṇā~~ olded verse. The Dpvs account is much shorter than that of the Smp. It does not refer to Asoka's question with regard to the sending of the Bodhi-tree, the reply of Moggaliputta Tissa, who related the five wishes of the Buddha, the making of the vessel by Vissakamma, the procession to the Bodhi-tree, the offering of the kingdom to the Bodhi-tree both by Asoka and Devānaṃpiya Tissa, the severing of the branch, the growth of the smaller branches, the fruits and the roots, the earthquake, the rejoicing by men and other beings, the disappearance of the tree among the snow-clouds, the bringing of it to Pāṭaliputta, the presentation of the vessels for the sprinkling of water, the embarking from Tāmalitti, the taking of the tree to the Nāga-world, the landing at Jambukola, the acceptance of the tree by Devānaṃpiya Tissa, the taking of it to Anurādhapura and the Mahāmeghavana garden, the details about the planting of the tree, the planting of the seed and the springing up of eight plants, the planting of them at the entrance to the village of the brahman Tivakka, at Thūpārāma, at the Issaranimmāna vihāra, near the Paṭhama cetiya, on the Cetiyapabbata, at Kāṭaragāma and Candanagāma, and the planting at the other Ārāmas of the thirty-two young bodhi-trees, which grew from

the seeds of the remaining four fruits.

There are no references to dates or to Saṃghamittā in this account or in the account of the pabbajjā of Anulā and the royal maidens. The only reference to the coming of the bhikkuṇis with the tree seems to be a later addition.

The Dpvs makes no reference also to the various families sent by Asoka to guard the Bodhi-tree. It only adds at the end in a badly constructed passage that Devānaṃpiya Tissa appointed eight chiefs from each of the warrior clans to guard the Bodhi-tree. Then follows in the Dpvs another account of the visits of the Buddha. This refers also to the names of the Mahāmeghavana in the times of the previous Buddhas, the acceptance of these gardens, the names of their Bodhi-trees and the names of the therīs ~~that~~ who brought the Bodhi-branches.

The Dpvs (XVII.184 - 191) gives a list of the buildings put up by Devānaṃpiya Tissa. They are the Tissārāma, the thūpa, the Cetiyārāma, the Thūpārāma, the Issarasamaṇa (?) vihāra, the Vessagiri and the Colakatissa (vihāras), and ārāmas at a distance of every yojana. There is no reference to the prophecy made by Mahinda about the building of the Mahāthūpa by Duṭṭhagāmini.

The Dpvs account of the nibbāna of Mahinda is much shorter than that of the Mhvs. The Dpvs does not mention the day and the month of the death, and does not say that Mahinda was at the time

spending the vassa season. It does not say that the chest and the bier were of gold. According to the Dpvs the funeral ceremonies at the Cetiya mountain lasted a week and then there was some hesitation about holding the cremation in the city. Finally the coffin was removed to the Mahāvihāra, where the funeral ceremonies were comtinued for another week. There is no reference at all to the nibbāṇa of Saṃghamittā.

The story of the miracle of the mango-tree (XV.38) was perhaps borrowed from the Sarabha-miga Jātāka (483) for there it is said: "Early in the morning the Master went on his rounds seeking alms. The king's (Bimbisāra) gardener Gaṇḍa was just taking to the king a fine ripe mango fruit, thoroughly ripe, big as a bushel. When he saw the Master at the city-gate he said: 'This fruit is worthy of the Master,' and gave it to him. The Master took it, and, sitting down then and there on one side, ate the fruit. When it was eaten he said: 'Ānanda, give the gardener this stone to plant here on this spot. This shall be the Gaṇḍa mango-tree.' The Thera did so. The gardner dug a hole in the earth, and planted it. Immediately the stone burst, roots sprouted forth and a red shoot tall as a plough-pole sprang up. Even as the crowd was looking it grew into a mango tree a hundred cubits high with a trunk fifty cubits high and branches fifty cubits high. At the same time flowers bloomed and fruits ripened. The tree stood, filling the sky, covered with bees and loaded with golden fruit."

Professor Sten Konow (Aus Indien Kultur: Festgabe für Richard von Garbe p.33) draws attention to a stone found in the Museum at Mathurā. It is about 37 cm. long and 26 cm. high. On the front side of it is the figure of an adorned elephant walking to the right. Above the back of the elephant in the upper left corner of the stone is a short inscription in five Kharoṣṭhi letters: śastakadhatu.

The characters show that the stone must originally have belonged to North-West India, but it is not known from what region it was brought to Mathurā. Professor Sten Konow is not sure of the age of this inscription but he places it towards the end of the second century A.D.

According to the Commentary of the Kāliṅga-Bodhi Jātaka (479) Ānanda gets permission to plant a seed of the great Bodhi-tree before the gateway of Jetavana. Mogallāna fetches a seed. The king of Kosala is asked to plant the seed, but he hands it over to Anāthapiṇḍika, who drops it into the golden jar. Immediately there springs up a bo-sapling as broad as a plough-head and fifty cubits tall, Also great branches, fifty cubits in length, spring up from it.

According to the Aśokāvadāna (L.E.A. p.261) the first wife of King Asoka, Tiṣyarakṣitā (Mhvs XX.3), seeing that Aśoka offered to the Bodh-tree the jewels he received without giving her any, asked the caṇḍāla Mātaṅga to injure it by pricking it. Mātaṅga bound the tree with a charmed thread and made it wither gradually by his incantations. When the tree was about to be fully withered the

guardians of the tree informed the king. The king was so affected by the news that he fainted and fell down on the ground. When he recovered he said that if the Bodhi-tree perished he would die. Tiṣyarakṣitā then said that she was always able to make him happy, but the king replied that the Bodhi-tree could but not a woman. Then Tiṣyarakṣitā, moved by the king's sorrow, asked Mātaṅga to make the tree live again. Mātaṅga unwound the thread and watered the tree with a thousand vessels of milk. After some time the tree was as it was before. When the king heard of this from the guardians he rejoiced and went to the tree. He then ordered a thousand vessels in gold, silver and vaiḍūriya to be made and filled with scented liquids and then the tree was bathed with these.

The account of Mahinda's coming to Ceylon and his entry into the capital does not seem to be based on any remembrance of the actual events. Perhaps the kernel of history in this legend is that Mahinda lived in Cetiyapabbata. Otherwise it is difficult to understand why he should be made to come from there into the city. It is difficult to believe, as will be shown later, that he lived in Mahāmeghavana. The fact that Thupārāma is called after the thūpa shows that this ārāma too came into existence later. At Cetiyapabbata there were the natural caves which were occupied by the early bikkhus. According to the Dpvs two of the other places occupied in the earliest times were Vedisagiri and Issarasamaṇa. Both these as well as the Naval Niravi Malei Inscription of the time of Uttiya show

that the earliest places occupied by the bhikkhus were caves. According to the Dpvs the death of Mahinda took place at Cetiyapabbata and the funeral ceremonies there lasted a week. Then he was taken to the Mahāvihāra and the ceremonies were continued for another week. The Mhvs (XX.34) says he died there while spending the vassa, and the funeral ceremonies took place at Mahāvihāra, and they lasted a week. The funeral ceremonies of the Buddha went on only for a week, and it is not likely that those of Mahinda lasted longer.

The Dpvs account shows that a second tradition has been added to the first. The Mhvs leaves out altogether the funeral ceremonies at Cetiyapabbata and accounts for the death of Mahinda at Cetiyapabbata by saying that he went there to spend the rainy season.

The story of the acceptance of the Mahāvihāra in the Mhvs is clearly a very late account. If such an account existed in the time when the Smp was composed it is not likely that it would have been omitted in its introduction. Many of these events are not recorded at all in the Smp while a few are mentioned in other connections. There is no mention of an account of the Mahāvihāra in the contents of the ~~Porāṇā~~ older verses, and therefore the account in the Dpvs cannot be one of its earliest parts. On the other hand the account itself is so unsatisfactory that it may be compared to those parts which seem to be very late additions. It is clearly

older than the account in the Mhvs though it contains passages the subject matter of which is not found in the Mhvs. It does not give details with regard to the position of the buildings about which predictions were made. Nor does it include the visits of the previous Buddhas. The reference to Meghavanārāma as one of the places visited by the Buddha in Dpvs II.130 seems to be an interpolation, and it shows that the Dpvs account too is a very late one. It seems to be later than the Smp account.

Another striking feature is that the predictions are made by Mahinda even when the place of the Mahāthūpa, built in later times by Duṭṭhagāmini, is visited by the Buddha. It is most likely that these predictions were attributed to Mahinda at a time when the places visited by the Buddha and his predictions were definitely fixed in the minds of the people. Otherwise there is no reason why the Mahāvihāravāsins should not have attributed them to the Buddha himself.

The reason given for Mahinda's spending the second night at Mahāmeghavana is also unsatisfactory. Mahinda and his followers are said to have gone by air from Vedisa to the Missaka mountain and then from there to Anuradhapura. Therefore the fact that it was evening-time was no hindrance to their return to Cetiyapabbata. The account of the presentation of the Mahāmeghavana in the Dpvs is very similar to the account of the presentation of Veluvaṇa by Bimbisāra.

It is also significant that Smp makes no mention of the name Tissārāma for the Mahāmeghavanārāma. In the story of Asoka his special vihāra is called Asokārama, but according to Indian accounts

there is no mention of a vihāra by that name. In the Aśokāvadāna the vihāra he frequents is the Kukkuṭārāma. After the story of Asoka was further developed in Ceylon the Mahāvihāra seems to have been called Tissārāma just as the special vihāra of Asoka was called Asokārāma. The Smp also makes no mention of the marking of the boundaries of the Mahāmeghavanārāma, and the reference to it in the Dpvs seems to be an interpolation. In the early accounts the Mahāmeghavana seems to have been important only on account of the fact that the Bodhi-tree was there. This account of the acceptance of the Mahāvihāra seems to be another attempt to glorify the Mahāvihāra by making it the first vihāra in Ceylon and ~~by making it~~ the residence of Mahinda.

The account of the acceptance of the Cetiyapabbata vihāra is perhaps an older account than that dealing with the Mahāvihāra. Nevertheless it does not seem to be a historical account. According to the Smp and the Mhvs (XVIII.5) in the account of the Bodhi-tree Mahāriṭṭha makes it a condition that he should be allowed to enter the pabbajjā when he undertakes to bring the Bodhi-tree and Saṃghamittā. But according to this account (XVI.10) he enters the pabbajjā much earlier. According to the Mahāvagga the first followers of the Buddha were five bikkhus. The next was Yasa who belonged to a seṭṭhi family. After him his four friends joined the Buddha. Then they were joined by fifty other friends who belonged to noble families. Thus according to the Mahāvagga there were sixty-two Arahants with the Buddha for the first vassa. According to the Mhvs (XVI.17) sixty-two arahants took up their abode during the first

vassa in Ceylon. These consisted of Mahinda, four other bhikkhus and the sāmaṇera Sumana who came from India, Bhaṇḍuka, a youth who belonged to a seṭṭhi family, Mahāriṭṭha and his fifty-five companions who, according to the Dpvs, belonged to noble families. Fifty-five seems to have been a common number. In Mhvs V.115 Soṇaka goes to Veḷuvana with fifty-five companions, and they all enter pabbajjā. . The number of arahants in Ceylon was really sixty-three. Perhaps it was made sixty-two to make it similar to the Mahāvagga account.

The account of the bringing of the relics formed a part of the ~~Porāṇā~~ oldest verses. Therefore the Dpvs account most probably forms one of its oldest parts. The Smp gives a much more developed form of the story. The Mhvs account is still younger, and there the bowl in which the relics were brought is made the bowl used by the Buddha himself, while according to the Smp the bowl belonged to Sumana.

At the end of the account the Dpvs narrates the previous visits of the Buddhas. The memorial verses on which the account is founded refers to the Buddha, the apostle, the mountain, the island, the city and the king. Hence the places given most prominence are Cetiyapabbata and Anuradhapura. Another more developed account of the visits is given at the end of the story of the bringing of the Bodhi-tree. The Smp also gives the account of the visits of the previous Buddhas in dealing with the building of the thūpa at Thūpārāma. In the Mhvs the story of the visits of the Buddhas is

related immediately after Mahinda's prediction about the Mahāthūpa, and thus an attempt is made to glorify also the Mahāthūpa.

The Dpvs makes no reference to the twin-miracle (XVII.43) or to the receiving of the pabbajā soon after the miracle by the younger brother of the king, Mattābhaya. This reminds one of the receiving of the pabbajjā by the younger brother of Asoka, Tissa, soon after he saw the miracle performed by the Thera Mahādhammarakkhita.

According to the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta Dona the brahman divided the relics among Ajātasattu, the Licchavis of Vesāli, the Sākiyas of Kapilavatthu, the Bulis of Allakappa, the Koliyas of Rāmagāma, Vethadīpaka, the brahman, the Mallas of Pāvā and the Mallas of Kusinārā. Dona was given the vessel in which the relics were put, and the Mariyas of Pipphalīvana took away the embers.

According to another account, which the Ceylonese commentator says was added to the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta by the Theras in Ceylon, seven portions of the relics were worshipped in India and the eighth was worshipped by the nāgas in Rāmagāma. One tooth was worshipped by the Tidiva gods and another by the nāgas. The two other teeth were in Gandhāra and in Kaliṅga.

According to Aśokāvadāna (L.E.A. p.102) Aśoka went

to the nāga-king of Rāmagrāma to get the relics, but the nāga-king did not give them. According to the text of the Aśokāvadāna inserted in the Tsa - a - han (Saṃyukta-āgama) Aśoka succeeded in taking them away. In another account (L.E.A. p.330) Mahākassapa goes to Tāvatiṃsa heaven to worship the tooth, the hair, the tiara and the bowl of the Buddha.

According to the Mhvs I.37 Sarabhu, the disciple of Sāriputta, by his miraculous power recovered even from the funeral pyre the collar-bone of the Buddha, and bringing it to Laṅkā laid it in the Mahiyaṅgana cetiya. In Mhvs XVII.20 it is said that Sakka gave to Sumana the right collar-bone of the Buddha, which was placed in the Thūpārāma cetiya. According to Mhvs. XXXI. 45 Somuttara fetches the relics that belonged to the nāgas of Rāmagrāma, and these are placed in the Mahācetiya built by Duṭṭhagāmiṇi.

Dr. E.J.Thomas (The Life of the Buddha p.158) deals with the various accounts concerning the relics of the Buddha. He points out that the second account of the relics did not originate in Ceylon, as it is found also in the Tibetan form of the sutta. The story of the relics of the Mahāthūpa clearly depends on this second account, but none of these accounts show how the legends about the collar-bones originated. The only evidence lies in the stone which Professor Sten Konow describes.

He translates śastakadhatu as the collar-bone of the Master and draws attention to the description in the Dpvs according to which the collar-bone was placed on the back of an elephant. Thus this story too, like many others already mentioned, seems to have been borrowed from N.W.India, the region occupied by the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

The story of the bringing of the Bodhi-tree also formed a part of the Porāṇā. The Dpvs account is short and the greater part of it is fantastic. The Smp account is nearly twice as long and the Mhvs account is still longer. The accounts, however, hardly contradict one another. The only real disagreement is in the number of women that entered the pabbajjā with Anulā. The Dpvs gives the customary number of five hundred. According to the Mhvs it is one thousand, and the number in the Smp is two thousand.

The story of the bringing of the Bodhi-tree to Ceylon receives no confirmation from inscriptions, sculptures or legends of India. The Girnar Edict VIII may be interpreted to mean that Asoka paid a visit to the Bodhi-tree. The Divyāvadāna (p.393) makes Asoka go to the Bodhi-tree in the company of sthavira Upagupta and distribute one hundred thousand pieces of gold.

According to the Aśokāvadāna Asoka had a greater affection for the Bodhi-tree than even for his wife. He made costly offerings

and bathed it with scented liquids from vessels of gold, silver, and viḍūriya, and had special guardians appointed to look after it. The Aśokāvadāna also refers to the attempt of Tissarakkhā (Mhvs, XX.3) to kill the tree, but it was not pricked by a maṇḍu thorn. Nor was the tree allowed to die.

Though none of these accounts confirm the Ceylon story it is clear from the Kāliṅga Bodhi Jātaka that descent from the Bodhi-tree at Gayā was not claimed for the tree in Ceylon alone. Even in Ceylon, according to the Smp and the Mhvs, a claim of descent from the tree at Gayā was made for almost every other Bodhi-tree planted near the different vihāras of early Ceylon.

According to the Mahāparinibbāna Suttanta (V.8) the Buddha is said to have asked the believing clansmen to visit after his death with feelings of reference the places where he was born, where he attained enlightenment, where he first preached and where he died. It is clear from this statement that there were pilgrimages to the Bodhi-tree not long after his death. It is not clear whether there was a thūpa at Kusinārā, but the last verses of the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta show that soon there were no less than eight thūpas which claimed to possess relics of the Buddha. When Buddhism spread into distant countries, thūpas were erected and Bodhi-trees were planted in these places so that the people might have objects to worship. At a later date tradition connected these

places with actual visits of the Buddha himself and claimed that the oldest thūpas, the building of which was no longer remembered, possessed actual relics of the Buddha and that the Bodhi-trees, the planting of which had passed away from the memory of men, were descended from the Bodhi-tree at Gayā.

The Mhvs (XIX. 1) and the Smp refer to the persons from various families ~~that~~ who were appointed by Asoka and sent to Ceylon to guard the Bodhi-tree. The Dpvs merely says that persons from khattiya families were appointed by Devānaṃpiya Tissa to guard the bodhi-tree. It is possible that the Taraccha (hyena) and the Kuliṅga (forktailed shrike) clans lived in Ceylon and claimed ~~their~~ descent from the legendary guardians who were said to have been appointed by Asoka. If these were actual clans of Ceylon the Sīhala tribe was not the only one that had the name of an animal.

It is striking that the Dpvs makes no reference to Saṃghamittā in the account of the Bodhi-tree. ~~Even~~ In other accounts Saṃghamittā at first does not seem to have received any attention. ~~Both~~ The Dpvs and Smp do not refer to her birth, but only mention the birth of Mahinda. According to the Smp Moggaliputta Tissa defines an heir of the sāsana as one who causes his only begotten son to enter the pabbajjā. The Dpvs and the Mhvs say son or daughter. The account of the decision of Saṃghamittā to come to Ceylon in the Dpvs occurs in a very unsatisfactory passage, and

there is also no reference to the death of Saṃghamittā in the Dpvs.

It has already been pointed out how all the evidence available seems to be unfavourable ~~for~~ to the belief that Mahinda is the son of Asoka. The accounts dealing with Saṃghamittā seem to show that she did not play any part in the earliest accounts of Ceylon.

The places in Ceylon mentioned in these chapters seem to be real. Nandana is the name of Indra's pleasure-garden, but there was also a park ~~by~~ of that name to the south of the southern gate of Anurādhapura. Mahinda is said to have delivered there some of his earliest sermons, and the first thūpa was also erected there. Even if the part dealing with Mahinda is not historical, there is no doubt that this place was connected with Buddhism from very early times. According to the Smp and the Mhvs (XV.202) this park was also called Jotivana, because it was the place where the true doctrine was made to shine. According to the Mhvs XXXVII.33 the Jotivana was also the name of the land between the Malwatte Oya and its tributary where the Jetavana dagoba stood. The Dpvs does not give this name, and is probably a name given much later.

The Dpvs account of the buildings which were caused to be erected seems to be a late addition, and ~~eve-y~~ everyone of the lines may be independent sentences. Much emphasis cannot be laid on this

account as Devānaṃpiya Tissa is said to have built also ārāmas at the distance of a yojana from each other. The buildings specially mentioned are the Tissārāma, the Cetiyārāma, the Thūpārāma, Issarasamaṇa(?), Vessagiri and Colakatissa. The name Tissārāma, as already mentioned, does not occur in the Smp and there is no reason to think that Devānaṃpiya Tissa put up a vihāra there. Mahāmeghavana, however, is connected with early Buddhism, as the Bo-tree stood there. A vihāra by the name of Colakatissa is not mentioned in the Mhvs. The line in the Dpvs may also mean that it was another name for Vessagiri. Vessagiri is a cluster of rocks about a mile to the South-West of the Bodhi-tree. It was undoubtedly one of the first places that were occupied by the Buddhist bhikkhus. As Dr.Wickremasinghe (Epigraphia Zeylanica Vol.I,p.10) points out, the rock-caves alone at first served as shelter for the bhikkhus. The inscriptions incised on the brows of the caves just below the drip-line most probably belong to the first century B.C. Issarasamaṇa or Isurumuṇiya lies on the way to Vessagiri. There too, as on Mihintale, there are caves and probably it was occupied in the earliest days.
The origin of these two names as given in Mhvs XX. 14 - 15, like that of Cetiyapabbata, does not seem to be historical. There is not even a reference to these conversions in the Dpvs. The thūpa, which is said to be built by Devānampiya Tissa, is also called a

great thūpa, and the reference to a mahāthūpa in connection with the third visit of the Buddha may refer to this, as the Thūpārāma cetiya is not mentioned.

The Thūpārāma vihāra, as the Mhvs points out (XVII.64), seems to have been built after the thūpa. The Smp makes no reference to the building of the vihāra or the marking of its boundaries. This building too was erected most probably in later times.

There are other places mentioned in the Mhvs and the Dpvs but not referred to in the Smp. The Nāgacatukka tank (Mhvs XIV.36 and XVI.6) on the Cetiyapabbata is mentioned in Dpvs XIV.117, but this line may be a later interpolation. The building of the tank (XV.31), the refectory (XV.50), and the salākā-house (XV.205) of the Mahāvihara are mentioned in the Dpvs as predictions, but this passage too, as pointed out earlier, may be a later account.

The Paṭhamacetiya, which stood outside the eastern gate of the city, is referred to in the Smp. It is difficult to say whether the reason given for the name in the Mhvs (XIV.45) is correct. The Upāsikāvihāra (XVIII.12 and XIX.68) and the Hatthāḷhaka vihāra XIX.83 are not mentioned in the Smp. These most probably came into existence very late. It is not said where the Upāsikāvihāra stood. The Hatthāḷhaka vihāra is said to have been built in the Kadamba flower-thicket. The refectory called Mahāpāli (XX.23) which stood near the Hatthaḷhaka vihāra is also not mentioned in the Smp. Other buildings not mentioned in the Smp are the Kadamba thūpa

(XIX.76), the Jambukolavihāra (XX.25), at Jambukola, the Tissamahāvihara, which, according to Prof. Geiger, was situated to the North-East of Hambantota, and the Pacinārāma in Anurādhapura, the Lopapāsāda (XV.206), the Kālāpāsādaparivena (XV.204), the Sunhātaparivena (XV.207), the Dīghacankamana parivena, the Marugaṇa parivena and the Dīghasandasenāpatiparivena, all in the Tissārāma. The Dīghasandasenāpati parivena is said to have been built by Devānampiya Tissa's commander of the troops. The building of the road is ascribed to ~~been built by~~ Devānampiya Tissa himself. In India it was the custom to credit Asoka with the building of the thūpas put up by people who were forgotten. Similarly in Ceylon it seems to have been the custom to credit such buildings to Devānampiya Tissa and Duṭṭhagāmini

Another thūpa mentioned is the Nivatta cetiya, which is said to have been built at the place where Mahinda turned back to go to the Mahāmeghavana. It is not said who built it, and there is no reference to it in the Smp. A hall is said to have been built in later times on the sea-shore where Devānampiya Tissa awaited the Bodhi-tree. The Mhvs (XIX.2) calls it Samuddapaṇṇasālā, and the Smp calls it Samuddasālā. The Kantaka-cetiya (XVI.13) and Ambatthala (XIII. 20) on the Cetiyapabbata, the village of the brahmin Tivakka, which lay between Jambukola and Anurādhapura, Kājāragāma (XIX.54 and 62), the modern Kataragama, and Candanagāma (XIX.54 and 62) in the Rohana country, Cetāvigāma (XVII.59) and the Mahānāgavana (XVII.7), situated in Anurādhapura, are mentioned in

the Smp, but not Vihārabiya, Gallakapiṭha (XVII.60), the Mahāāsana (XIX.58) and the Kakudha-pond (XV.52) which stood near the Mahāthūpa.

Other places that must have existed when the Mhvs was composed are the uposatha-hall (XB.37), ~~the~~ Catussālā (XV.50) in the Tissārāma, Cittāsālā, which lay to the end of the Thūpārāma, and Isibhūmi. Of these Isibhūmi is mentioned in the Dpvs and the uposatha-hall in the Tissārāma in the Smp.

The Smp says that the thūpa of the Thūpārāma was of the shape of a heap of paddy. According to the Mhvs the Mahāthūpa built by Dutthagāmiṇi was one hundred and twenty cubits high. This is the height of this dagoba without the tee. It is possible that the tee did not exist in the earliest dagobas.

According to the Mhvs (XV.59, 93 and 127) Ceylon in the time of the three Buddhas previous to Gotama was called Ojadīpa, Varadīpa, and Maṇḍadīpa. Oja, vara and maṇḍa are synonyms, meaning excellent or the best. There is no reason to think that these names have any historical significance.

It is strange that the Mhvs should ascribe the building of the Lohapāsāda to Devānaṃpiya Tissa. The M Ṭ (p.259) explains this away by saying that Duṭṭhagamiṇi built his Lohapāsāda after the old one had been removed. It is more likely

that there was more than one tradition about the building of the Lohapāsāda. [Two ancient sea-routes from India to Ceylon have already been dealt with in the chapter on Vijaya. The writer of the Dpvs mentions a western route from Bharukaccha while the Mhvs speaks of an eastern route. According to the Dpvs chapter XII, Mahinda travelled from Pāṭaliputta to Vedisa and fled from there to Ceylon. Chapter XVI says that Asoka, taking the Bodhi-tree, crossed the Vindhya mountains before he came to the ocean. According to the Smp (p.80) and the Mhvs (chapter XIII) Mahinda travelled from Pāṭaliputta to Dakkhiṇagiri and then to Vedisa, and fled from there to Ceylon, and according to the Smp (p.96) and the Mhvs (chapter XIX) the Bodhi-tree was taken from Pāṭaliputta to Tāmalitti in a ship down the Ganges, while Asoka travelled to the same place crossing the Vindhya mountains.

It is clear from these accounts that the author of the Dpvs is still thinking of the western route while the authors of the Smp and the Mhvs have an eastern route in mind. It is also clear that the Dpvs tradition is the older one, as the Smp and the Mhvs make Asoka cross the Vindhya mountains, as the Dpvs does, and then make him go to Tāmalitti, thus taking a circuitous way.

It is possible, however, that the oldest route was not a sea-route on the west or the east but a land route to the south or south-east of India. According to Akitti-Jātaka (480) the

Bodhisat travels from Benares to Kavīrapaṭṭana and then by air to Kāradīpa. The Pārāyanavagga of the Sutta-nipāta gives an ancient route from the Godāvarī past Alakassa, Paṭiṭṭhāna, Māhissati, Ujjenī, Gonaddha, Vedisa, Kosambī, Sāketa, Sāvatthi, Setavya, Kapilavatthu, Kusinārā, Pāvā and Bhoganagara to Vesāli.

In the Kalsi Ediet XIII of Asoka the Andhras, the Choḍas and the Pandyas are mentioned as people among whom the conquest of ~~morality~~ dhamma had been won. Buddhism is also known to have flourished in Kāñchi and in Amarāvati on the Kistna in very early times. Dr.Wickremasingha (Ep.Zeyl.Vol.I.No.2,p.13) says that the form of the letter ma peculiar to Ceylon in the Vessagiri inscriptions, which belong to the first century B.C. may have been developed from the form of ma found in the edicts of Asoka in Siddāpura in Mysore and in the inscriptions on the crystal prism from the stūpa at Bhaṭṭiprōlu near the mouth of the Kistna. Hence it is ~~more~~ likely that Buddhism reached Ceylon from South India rather than from the west of India by sea.

Thus a close examination of these chapters shows that they are not very different from the chapters dealt with already. The ballads in the Dpvs could not have been composed at a time when the introduction of Buddhism was remembered by the people. It is most likely that a bhikkhu by the name of Mahinda introduced Buddhism first into Ceylon during the reign of the King Devānaṃpiya Tissa and lived in Mihintale. Perhaps bhikkhus also took with their

abode at Vessagiri and Isuramuṇiya. It is possible that there was also a bhikkhuṇī called Saṃghamittā at this time or later, but considering the historical value of the other accounts it is difficult to believe that the queen became a bhikkhuṇī. The Bo-tree and the thūpa of the Thūpārama may have belonged to this period, but it is impossible to come to any definite conclusion.

## Appendix I.

## The Chronology of the Mahāvaṃsa.

# The Chronology of the Mahāvaṃsa.

## I. Indian Kings.

The dates of King Asoka and of the Indian kings that preceded him up to Bimbisāra are given in the Mhvs II. 25 - 32, IV. 1 - 8, V. 14 - 21, and XX. 1 - 6. The dates and the order of the reigns in these passages are not always in agreement with the Dpvs. There is no difference with regard to the first three kings, Bimbisāra, Ajātasattu and Udayabhadda, but the Dpvs makes no mention of Anuruddha and Muṇḍa. There is, however, a gap of eight years, the period which, according to the Mhvs, was ruled by these two kings. According to the Dpvs Nagadāsa rules for twenty-two years. It may be that he ruled for twenty-three years, but he could not have ruled for twenty-four years, the number of the Mhvs. Susunāga rules for ten years and not eighteen, and, according to the Dpvs V, line 212, he is followed by ten brothers, who rule for twenty-tow years. In the Mhvs Susunāga is followed by Kālāsoka, who reigns for twenty-eight years, and then by the ten brothers who are said to be sons of Kālāsoka. Kālāsoka is referred to in the Dpvs thrice. IV. 93 - 96 and V. 168 - 169 refer to the same dates but IV. 93 - 96 add another half month to the dates of Paṇḍukābhaya and Kālāsoka. Both these passages are not in the usual style and like V. 214, which seems to be an interpolation, fit

in rather with the Mhvs chronology than with the Dpvs; for according to the Dpvs the ten brothers and Kālāsoka rule at the same time. The third reference to Kālāsoka in the Dpvs is in the second account of the Second Council, and, perhaps, the dates of Kālasoka came to be added later. The Dpvs also omits the nine Nandas and according to deductions from the Dpvs XI. 10 - 11 and 22 - 24 Bindusara's reign lasted for thirty-two years not twenty-eight as in the Mhvs.

The Burmese tradition (Geiger's Introduction to the Eng. Translation of the Mhvs p.XL) is very similar to that of the Mhvs. There is some difference, however, in the length of the reigns. The nine Nandas are called Uggasena Nanda and eight brothers, while Bhaddasena and eight brothers are given in place of the ten sons of Kālāsoka. In the Aśokāvadāna the first three kings are the same as in the Dpvs and the Mhvs. Anuruddha is not mentioned, and instead of the kings from Nāgadāśaka to the nine Nandas it gives Kākavarṇin, Sahālin, Tulakuci, Mahāmaṇḍala, Prasenajit, and Nanda. Candagutta's name is also omitted. The Jain tradition gives to Udāyin (Udayabhadda) a reign of sixty years. His two predecessors are Śreṇika and Kūṇika. The kings from Anuruddha to Kālāsoka are not given. In the Purāṇas the names of the kings before Candragupta, who are common to the Mhvs are Śisunāga, Bimbisāra, Ajātaśatru, and Udāyin. Kākavarṇa and Darśaka may be the same as Kālāśoka and

Nāgadāsaka. The order of the kings in the Purāṇas is quite different. Professor Geiger deals with these lists in his Introduction to the English transaltion of the Mhvs, and Professor Rapson discusses their historical value in the Camb.History of India Vol. I p.311. All that Professor Rapson says in favour of the Ceylon list is that it affords the best working hypothesis which has yet been discovered.

## 2. The Ācariyaparamparā.

The period of life of the patriarchs from their upasampadā is given in the Dpvs with Indian and Ceylonese synchronisms. Upāli is credited with seventy-four years, Dāsaka sixty-four, Soṇaka sixty-four, Siggava seventy-six, Moggaliputta Tissa eighty, and Mahinda sixty. These dates do not seem to be historical, as it is not likely that everyone of them lived so long. The chronology was worked out, most probably, at a very late date.

## 3. The Buddha.

The Mhvs chapters I and III give a few dates connected with the Buddha. His enlightenment and his death takes place on the full-moon of Vesākha. His first visit to Ceylon takes place on the full-moon of Phussa, nine months after his enlightenment. The second visit is on the uposatha day of the dark half of Citta in the fifth year, and the third visit is on the full-moon day of Vesākha in the eighth year. The Dpvs merely says that the first visit took place nine months after the enlightenment and the second and third visits

were in the fifth and in the eighth year respectively. These events are discussed in the chapter on the Buddha and his visits to Ceylon.

The date of Buddha's death has received the attention of many scholars. As far as the Ceylon tradition is concerned, it seems to have been calculated taking the eighth year of Ajātasattu as the year of the death of the Buddha. It is not yet certain how far the relations between the Buddha and the Indian kings recorded in the Pāli Canon are historical. Nor is it clear why the eighth year of Ajātasattu was taken as the date of the death. The full-moon of Vesākha as the day of the death is undoubtedly a late tradition and is not in agreement with the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta. The disagreements with regard to the reigns of the Indian kings show how doubtful is the statement that Asoka was consecrated two hundred and eighteen years after the death of the Buddha, and the year 483 B.C., as Rhys Davids points out (Camb. Hist. of India Vol. I, p. 172), must be accepted only as a working hypothesis.

## 4. Asoka.

The Mhvs gives a few dates connected with Asoka. Asoka rules for four years before his consecration, and he is consecrated two hundred and eighteen years after the death of the Buddha. Three years after he is converted by the śrāmaṇera Nigrodha, who was born soon after his father Sumana was killed, and was, therefore, seven years old ~~now~~ at the time. The deaths of the Theras, Tissa and Sumitta, take place in his eighth year.

The third Council is finished in his seventeenth year. The Smp adds that at Asoka's coronation Mahinda was fourteen years. Therefore his upasampadā was in Asoka's sixth year. He became head of the saṃgha at the age of twenty-three, i.e. in the ninth year of Asoka when Moggaliputta left for the Ahogaṅga mountain. For seven years before the Third Council the uposatha ceremony is not held, and the Council which lasts for nine months finishes in the seventeenth year. In Asoka's eighteenth year the Bodhi-branch is sent to Ceylon, in his thirtieth year Asaṃdhimitta dies, in his thirty-fourth year Tissarakkhā becomes queen, in his thirty-seventh year the Bodhi-tree perishes and in his forty-first year he dies. The Mhvs, however, says it makes up thirty-seven years. This is not possible unless four years are deducted; but four years can not be deducted, as the Bodhi-branch was brought eighteen years after the consecration. These dates, nevertheless, show that at the time the Mhvs was composed there was a fully worked out chronology for the chief events of Asoka's life. They do not seem to be historical, and some of these dates are discussed in the chapter on Asoka.

## 5. Paṇḍukābhaya.

According to the Mhvs the two attempts to kill Paṇḍukābhaya took place when he was seven and twelve respectively. At sixteen he went to the brahman Paṇḍula and studied under him. Then he made war, and went towards the Ḍola mountain and sojourned there for four years.

Next he defeats his uncles, and occupies their fortified camp for two years, and the uncles depose King Abhaya. Next Paṇḍukābhaya lives four years on the Dhūmarakkha mountain and seven years on the Ariṭṭha mountain. The M Ṭ, however, says that according to the Aṭṭhakathā Paṇḍukābhaya stayed five years near the Doḷa mountain and six years on the Ariṭṭha mountain. According to the Mhvs Paṇḍukābhaya became king at thirty-seven and ruled for seventy years. He marked the village boundaries in his tenth year.

According to the Dpvs Abhaya was deposed when Paṇḍukābhaya was twenty years old. Since Abhaya's dethronement took place after Paṇḍukābhaya's uncles were defeated the Mhvs takes no account of the time Pandukābhaya studied and made war before he went towards the Doḷa mountain. If Paṇḍukābhaya spent five years near the Doḷa mountain the calculation is clearly not in agreement with the Dpvs. It is not strange that Paṇḍukābhaya is made to live one hundred and seven years as, according to the Mahāpadāna Suttanta, the age of a man at this time was a little less or more than a hundred years.

## 6. Mahinda and Devānampiya Tissa.

The first consecration of Devānampiya Tissa takes place in Maggasira on the first day of the bright half of the month. The ministers of Devānampiya Tissa take two weeks to go to Pāṭaliputta, and spend five months there. They embark at Tāmalitti on the 1st.day

of the bright half of Vesākha, and arrive on the twelfth day. The second consecration takes place on the full-moon of Vesākha.

The missionaries are sent in the month of Kattika in the same year as the first consecration. Mahinda spends six months at Dakkhiṇāgiri and one month at Vessagiri, and comes to Mihintale on the uposatha day of Jeṭṭha. He goes to the city the next day and spends twenty-six days at the Meghavanārāma. On the 13th day of the bright half of Āsāḷha he goes again to Mihintale, and on the full-moon day the vihāra is consecrated. At the end of the vassa on the full-moon day of Kattika the pavāraṇa is held. It is then that Sumana goes for the relics, and sees Asoka at the Kattika festival.

Mahāriṭṭha embarks on the second day of the bright half of the month of Assayuja in order to bring Saṃghamittā and the Bodhi-tree, and reaches Pāṭaliputta the same day. The Bodhi-tree becomes invisible for seven days and Asoka makes offerings for another seven days. He receives the Bodhi-tree on the fifteenth day in the bright half of Assayuja. Two weeks later in the dark half of Assayuja on the fourteenth uposatha day the Bodhi-tree is brought to Pāṭaliputta. On the first day of the bright half of Kattika the tree is placed on the east side of the foot of a sāla-tree. On the second day the shoots appear. Asoka's journey to Tāmalitti takes a week. On the first day of the bright half of Maggasira the tree is taken to the ship. The nāgas take

it away for a week. After the tree arrives in Ceylon ceremonies are held for three days. On the tenth day the tree is removed from the shore. On the fourteenth day it is brought near Anurādhapura. If the tree is planted in the eighteenth year of Asoka, the event takes place during the first rainy season. Hence the tree is brought before the relics, and Mahāriṭṭha goes to India without observing the vassa properly.

According to the Mhvs the first consecration of Devānaṃpiya Tissa is in the month of Maggasira and the second coronation is in the month of Vesākha. The death of the Buddha takes place in the month of Vesākha. Asoka begins his reign two hundred and eighteen years after the death of the Buddha. The Council is completed in the month of Kattika in his seventeenth year. Mahinda arrives in Ceylon in the month of Jeṭṭha. Hence Mahinda comes to Ceylon in the two hundred and thirty-sixth year after the death of the Buddha. This is in agreement with the Smp p.72 according to which Muṭasiva dies in the seventeenth year of Asoka. The Smp, however, does not agree with the Mhvs that Mahinda stayed nearly a month before he went to Cetiyapabbata again. It says that on the seventh day he returned to Cetiyagiri.

According to the Dpvs XVII. 161 - 162 Devānaṃpiya Tissa is consecrated two hundred and thirty-six years after the death of the Buddha, and according to XI. 28 the consecration takes

place in the month of Āsāḷha. According to VI.1 Asoka is consecrated two hundred and eighteen years after the death of the Buddha. According to XI. 79 - 80 Devānaṃpiya Tissa's second coronation takes place in the month of Vesakhā, and Mahinda (XV. 140 - 142) comes to Ceylon two hundred and thirty-six years after the death of the Buddha in the month of Jeṭṭha (Dpvs XII.84 and XVII. 83).

If the Buddha was born in Vesākha, as is implied in V.9, Asoka's coronation is in the two-hundred and nineteenth year. Devānaṃpiya Tissa's first coronation is in the two hundred and thirty-seventh year. Devānampiya Tissa's second coronation takes place when two hundred and thirty-seven years are completed, and Mahinda comes in the two hundred and thirty-eighth year.

According to the Dpvs XI. 27 the first consecration of Devānaṃpiya Tissa takes place when Asoka had ruled for sixteen years and six months. Then Asoka's consecration must have been in the month of Phussa. Therefore if the death of the Buddha was in Vesākha, Devānaṃpiya Tissa's first coronation is in the two hundred and thirty-sixth year and Mahinda comes in the two hundred and thirty-seventh year. Hence it is clear that the Dpvs calculations not only disagree with those of the Mhvs but are also not in harmony with some of the statements within it.

If Asoka's consecration was in Phussa it may be assumed

that the Buddha too died in Phussa. This seems to be in harmony with the tradition in the Mahāparinibbāṇa Suttanta. Dr. E.J. Thomas (The Life of Buddha p.157) points out that though the implied chronology in the Mahāparinibbāṇa is vague, it is sufficient to show that the death did not take place in Vesākha but in December or January (Maggasira or Phussa or Māgha or Phagguna). It is also said that when the Buddha died the sāl trees were in bloom out of season. If the Buddha died in the month of Vesākha (March-April or April-May), this can hardly be correct, as the sāl tree is never quite leafless and the young foliage appears in March with the flowers. The seed ripens in June (D.Brandis, Indian Trees p.69).

## 7. The Ceylon Kings from Vijaya to Asela.

The dates of the Ceylon kings from Vijaya to Asela cannot be taken seriously. The length of Vijaya's reign and that of the second Interregnum were perhaps already fixed when the chronology was constructed. All the other reigns, except that of Sena and Guttika, are given in round numbers. According to the Dpvs Sena and Guttika ruled twelve years, but the Mhvs gives them twenty-two years. As Dr.Wickremasingha points out (Ep.Zeyl.Vol.III. Part I, p.1) the calculations seem to have been made by taking Devānaṃpiya Tissa and Asoka as contemporaries. The dates of the various events of the reigns seem to have been worked out at a still later date. Some of these dates are discussed in the chapter on Paṇḍuvāsudeva, Abhaya and Paṇḍukābhaya.

## Appendix II.

## THE DĪPAVAṀSA : A TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

# The Dīpavamsa: A Textual Criticism.

## Chapter I.

The first three lines are given in M Ṭ p.22 as a quotation from the Porāṇā, but instead of narindāgamanaṃ vaṃsaṃ it has narindāgamanā vāsaṃ. The change in the M Ṭ is perhaps grammatically better. The M Ṭ also quotes from the Porāṇā, lines 8 - 11 in the Dpvs, but instead of vaṃsavaraggavāsinaṃ apubbam it has vaṃsavaraggavādinam sabbam, and instead of sunātha sunantu, and atippasatthaṃ in place of thutippasatthaṃ. Lines 4 and 5 may have been influenced by Bu I. 80.:

Pītipāmojjajananam sokasallavinodanaṃ

Sabbasampatti - paṭilābham cittikatvā suṇotha me,

and line 6 is similar to Bu I.19,:

Udaggacittā sumanā passanti Lokanāyakaṃ.

Lines 1 - 7 and lines 8 - 11 most probably were independent passages as they are not in the same metre. Lines 14 and 15 are also in a different metre and seem to be a later interpolation. The phrase nisajja pallaṅkavare is similar to the phrase nisajja pāsādavare in Ch. I. 8.1. Lines 16 and 17 seem to have been added to connect the interpolation with what follows, and they form one sentence along with the next couplet. Line 17 is similar to Bu II. 67:

Anāsavā vītamalā santacittā samāhitā.

and line 25 to line 3 in Sutta Nipāta p. 992,

Sabbadhammakkhayaṃ patto vimutto upadhisaṃkhaye.

In line 32 the word laye should be repeated. Lines 36 and 37 were probably later additions. They consist merely of descriptive epithets

Line 46 seems to be out of place here. The first person ahaṃ is suddenly introduced, while the verb in line 48 is again in the third person. Lines 47 and 48 are similar to Bu XXVII. 20:

Ācikkhitvāna taṃ maggam nibbutā te sasāvaka

and Bu IV. 31:

Jalitvā aggikhando va suriyo atthaṅgato yathā.

Line 49 again seems to be an independent line, and cannot belong to the next couplet. Line 50 does not follow line 49. Either a line is omitted after 49 or this passage is a bad compilation. It is possible that lines 46 - 55 were added later, perhaps at different times. Lines 58 and 59 are clearly a memorial couplet. Line 62 partly repeats line 61 and line 63 is directly borrowed from Bu XXVI. 2:

Brahmunā yācito santo dhammacakkaṃ pavattayiṃ

atthārasannaṃ koṭīnam pathamābhisamayo ahu.

The construction of this sentence is grammatically wrong. Line 67 is similar to Bu XXVI. 17:

Bārāṇasi Isipatane cakkam pavattitaṃ mayā.

From line 70 the style changes. The preceding verses mention

the events that took place with very few details. Now the account follows to some extent Vinaya I.15, and the language is similar. For instance line 70 is represented in Vinaya I. 15 by Atha kho bhagavā anupubbena cārikam caramāno yena Uruvelā tad avasari. Line 71 is similar to line 35. Line 72 is an independent line. Line 73 was probably added later to fill up the couplet. This detail is not found in the Vinaya. Line 80 shows the influence of Vin.I.19.4: mahaddiko kho mahāsamaṇo mahānubhāvo, and line 83 of Vin.I.19.3: aho nūna mahāsamaṇo svatanāya nāgaccheyya. Lines 84 and 85 are probably commentarial matter added later. Lines 89 and 90 do not follow the Vinaya Piṭaka. Line 91 is a repetition of line 35. Line 92 is an independent line. Lines 93 and 94 may be later additions as they form a list. Lines 104 - 109 seem to be an interpolation as the metre is different. In line 106 there is one syllable ~~less~~ short, and lines 107 and 108 are metrically bad and vikubbamāno in line 108 is a prose form. Line 109 shows the influence of Vin I. 2.3.

The speakers of couplets beginning with lines 110, 112 and 114 are not given. Line 116 is similar to J.547. G. 181.

Thiṭe majjhantike kāle sannisinnesu pakkhisu.

Lines 112, 124 and 125 are metrically bad, and lines 124 and 125 have some similarity to J. 544. G.163:

Taṃ āruhantaṃ pabbatasahhikasaṃ

Aṅgāra‿rasim jalitaṃ bhayānakam.

It is possible that lines 116 - 125 were added later.

The metre changes once more with line 126. Line 127 seems to be commentarial matter. It refers to ten divisions but gives only six. Without it the couplet is correct. The second part of line 27 seems to have been borrowed from J. 514. G.8

Disa catasso vidisa catasso

Uddham, addho, dasa disā imāyo.

The M Ṭ (p.50) quotes two verses from the Porāṇā, which are similar to the Dpvs lines 131 and 132.

Yakkhānaṃ buddho bhayajananaṃ ākāsi.

Te tajjitā taṃ saraṇamagaṃsu buddhaṃ

Lokanukampo lokahite sadārato

So cintayī atthasukhaṃ amānuse.

The next verse in M Ṭ is:

Imañ ca laṅkātalamānusānaṃ

Porāṇakappaṭṭhitavuttavāsaṃ

Vasantu laṅkātale mānusā bahu.

Pubbeva ojavaramaṇḍasādise.

The second verse is the same as Dpvs lines 145 and 146 except for the form sādise, which is grammatically better. Line 132 is similar to Bu XI.17.

Anukampako kāruṇiko hite si sabbapāṇinaṃ

Lines 133 - 144 describe Giridīpa and the handing over of it to the yakkhas. The Mhvs omits this description. The description itself consisting mainly of epithets ends with line 140.

Lines 141 and 142 consist only of epithets and may be later additions.

## Chapter II.

Line 3 is similar to J.329 G.3:

Yāva n'upajjati buddho dhammarājā pabhaṃkaro

Lines 9 - 12 describe the nāgas and may be a later addition. Lines 15 - 24 are in a different metre and this passage does not seem to have influenced the Mhvs account. Lines 25 and 26 do not seem to be quite appropriate here. The unsuitability seems to be due to the interpolation. The phrase Idam vatvāna saṃbuddho in lines 27 and 99 occurs in Apadāna (Par. Dīp. p.40. G. 6.):

Idam vatvāna saṃbuddho Tisso lokaggo nāyako.

while line 33 is similar to Bu II.176.

Buddhassa vacanam sutvā mano nibbāyi tāvade.

Lines 41 and 42 partly repeat the previous couplets and are similar to Ang.Nik. Vol.IV p.96 G.5:

Kuddho atthaṃ na jānāti, kuddho dhammam na passati
Andhatamaṃ tadā hoti, yaṃ kodho sahate naraṃ .

and Dhmp. G. 146.

Andhakārena onaddhā padīpam na gavessathā,

and line 47 is similar to J.541 G.5:

Salomahaṭṭhaṃ ñatvāna vāsavo avocā nimiṃ

and line 49 of J.511 G.29:

Evaṃ mahānubhāvo si abbhuto lomahaṃsano

Lines 51 and 52 describe the Buddha, the speaker of lines 53 and 54. Lines 51 and 52 may be later additions as the speaker of line 55 is not given. Line 55 perhaps has been influenced by J.543 G.104:

Ayaṃ nāgo mahiddhiko tejasī duratikkamo.

Again his line 57 mentioning the speaker seems to be a later addition. Lines 58 and 59 seem to form a couplet. The phrase anukampāya cakkhuma in line 70, is similar to Therigātha 148. It is not clear whether dīpānam like pājānaṃ is an Accusative form. It is more likely that the Dpvs refers to two dīpas. Line 78 is similar to Cp.I.6.3:

Acchādanañ ca sayanañ ca annapānañ ca bhojanam

and line 80 to Par. Dīp V. p.7 G.4:

Svāgatam vala me āsi Buddasetṭhassa santike.

Lines 81 - 97 seem to interrupt the account; at least lines 81 - 92 seem to be a passage from another ballad. Line 97 seems to have been inserted to connected the following couplet with what precedes. Perhaps lines 93 - 96 were introduced later, when the visits of the Buddha began to be connected with defibite places of worship.

In line 102 the form Maṇikkhiko was perhaps used for the sake of metre, and the line itself is reminiscent of Bu V. 15.

Ahaṃ tena samayena nāgarājā mahiddhiko.

Line 104 may have been a later addition as lines 105 and 106 form a complete couplet without it. Lines 109 and 110 may also be a later addition, as they are merely are describes. Lines 111 and 112 are similar to J.532 G.22:

Assamam parimajjitvā paññāpetvāna āsanaṃ

and Par Dīp V. p.273 G.5:

Buddhapamukhasaṃghassa niyyādetvā pamoditā

Lines 115 and 116 refer to a mahāthūpa, but the Kalyāṇi cetiya is nowhere else called a mahāthūpa. Perhaps this couplet has been inserted in the wrong place. Lines 117 and 118 are similar to Bu XXII.12:

Mahādānam pavattetvā rattiṃ divam atandito

and Bu XVII. 9:

Paṭiggahetvā sambuddho idam vacanam abravi.

Line 117 is an independent line and may have been introduced later. Line 122 may also have been added later to connect the couplet that follows. In Line 125 tiṇi is grammatically wrong and line 126 is similar to Cp. II. 5.3:

Taṃ thānaṃ upagantvāna tiṭṭhāmi casayāmi ca.

No speaker is again given for lines 127 and 128. This couplet is perhaps more appropriate after line 132. Line 132 itself is an independent line and may have been later inserted. Lines 133, 137 and 139 are reminiscent of Bu XXIII.19:

Brahmuno yācito santo Kakusandho lokanāyako,

Bu XXV. 3:

Dhammacakkappavattente Kassape lokanāyake

and Bu XXVI. 17:

Ahaṃ Gotamasaṃbuddho saranam sabbapāṇinaṃ

Line 131 is also an independent line, and lines 129 and 130 along with line 131 and 132 may be a later interpolation, as they interrupt the account of the Bodhi trees.

## Chapter III.

Lines 1 and 2 undoubtedly show the influence of Cp I. 1. 2:

Atīta kappe caritam ṭhapayitvā bhavābhave

Imamhi kappe caritam pavakkhissaṃ sunohi me

As Franke points out, this introduction is inappropriate for a line of kings, as it speaks of various existences, and it is also incorrect as Arindama and Sudassana are said to belong in the Bu to the Maṇḍakalpa. Line 9 may have been influenced by Bu XIII.11:

Ahaṃ tena samayena catudīpamhi issaro

Antalikkhacaro āsi cakkavattī mahabbalo.

Line 14 shows the influence of Bu XXII.11:

Ahaṃ tena samayena Sudassano nāma khattiyo

Line 15 was probably influenced by Cp. I. 4.1:

Mahāsudassano nāma cakkavattī mahabbalo

and line 15 is similar to Śp. I. 6.1:

Punāparaṃ yadā homi Mithilāyam puruttame.

Lines 19 - 26 seem to be a later addition. They give commentarial matter. Lines 20 and 21 are irregular in metre. Line 29 shows the influence of Bu XXI. 9:

Tesaṃ pacchimako rājā Arindamo nāma khattiyo.

Lines 36, 88 and 94 are similar to Bu XX. 5:

Caturāsī‿tisahassāni sambuddham anupabbajuṃ.

and line 97 to Śp. III. 6.3:

Kicchā laddham piyaṃ puttaṃ abhijātaṃ jutindharaṃ

Lines 118 and 119 are the same as the Gātha of J.95 or Dīgha Nikāya XVI.6.10.

Line 127 does not seem to be grammatically correct. The first part may have been influenced by J.547 G.640:

Pitā maṃ anumodeyya itopattaṃ sakaṃ gharaṃ

Line 142 is similar to Bu XXII.4:

Pakkante cārikaṃ ratṭhe lokajeṭṭhe narāsabhe

## Chapter IV.

Lines 1 and 2 are not regular in metre, and line 2 consists only of epithets. This couplet may have been introduced later. Lines 5 - 9 form a list and may have been inserted later. Lines 10 and 18 seem to have been introduced to form sentences with the

preceding lines. Line 11 seems to have been added to connect these lines with what follows. Without line 11 the couplet is incomplete. Line 12 partly repeats line 11. Lines 14 and 15 are not in their proper places. Lines 16 - 22 may also be a later addition. Similarly lines 23 - 26 can be removed without any interference with the account. Line 29 is an independent sentence. Lines 30 and 31 should have come at the beginning. Lines 32 and 33 as well as 35 and 36 are probably commentarial matter. Perhaps line 34 was later introduced, as lines 35 and 36 form a couplet without it. Lines 37 and 38 are again not quite in their appropriate place. Similarly lines 39 and 40 should have come earlier. Lines 41 - 43 form one sentence. Lines 48 - 51 also form one sentence. Perhaps lines 49 and 50, which consist mainly of epithets were inserted later. Thus it is clear that this account is a compilation. Lines 5 - 10 and 16 - 18 may have been influenced by Bu I. 59 - 62:

Mahākassapo pi ca thero.....
Dhūtaguṇe agganikkhitto thomito satthuvaṇṇito
Dibbacakkhūnaṃ yo aggo Anuruddho mahāgaṇi
.....
Vinaye agganikkhitto Upāli satthuvaṇṇito
Sukhumanipuṇatthapaṭividdho kathikānaṃ pavaro gaṇī
Isamantāniyā putto Puṇṇo nāmā ti vissuto.

Lines 19 and 20 consist only of epithets and are similar to Bu II.204.

Cattāri satasahassāni chalabhiññā mahiddhikā

and to Bu II.6:

Lakkhaṇee itihāse ca sadhamme pāramiṅgato.

Lines 21 and 31 are similar to Bu V.2:

Dhammasaṅkhasamāyuttaṃ navaṅgam jinasāsanam.

and to Bu III.23:-

Suttantam vinayam cāpi navaṅgam satthusāsanam.

Perhaps lines 23 and 24 have been influenced by Dīgha XVI.4.8:

Sammukhā me taṃ āvuso bhagavato sutaṃ sammukhā

~~Sammukhā~~ patiggahītaṃ, ayaṃ dhammo ayaṃ vinayo idam

~~Idaṃ~~ satthusāsanaṃ.

Line 42 is similar to J.546 G. 122:

Upāsanamhi katahatthe vālaveḍhe samāgate,

and line 46 to J.546 G.222:

Evam sabbaṅgasampannaṃ sabbakāmasamiddhinaṃ

Perhaps the neuter form of saṃgahaṃ is the result of the influence of sampannaṃ.

Lines 64 and 65 partly repeat lines 62 and 63. Similarly lines 70 and 71 partly repeat lines 68 and 69. Line 70 is similar to Bu I.46:

Khīṇāsavānaṃ vimalānaṃ khaṇena sannipātayi.

Lines 74 and 75 again partly repeat lines 68 and 69. Lines 82 - 85 are probably an interpolation, as no such details are given about the other teachers.

The prose passage after line 98, apparently taken from

Cullavagga XII, is perhaps intended as commentarial matter. Line 101 is an independent sentence and was perhaps introduced later. Lines 102 - 106 give a list of persons, and do not form a sentence. Perhaps they are a later interpolation. In the Smp (p.34) the difficulty is got over by the addition of another line. The passage runs as follows:-

Yehi therehi saṃgītā saṃgīti tesu vissutā
Sabbakāmī ca Sāḷho ca Revato Khujjasobhito
Yaso ca Sāṇasambhūto ete saddhivihārikā
Therā Ānandattherassa diṭṭhapubbā tathāgataṃ
Sumano Vāsabhagāmi ca ñeyyā saddhivihārikā
Dve ime Anurādhassa diṭṭhapubbā tathāgataṃ
Dutiyo pana saṃgīto yehi therehi saṃgaho
Sabbe pi pannabhārā te katakiccā anāsavā.

## Chapter V.

Lines 7,8 and 9 form one sentence. Perhaps line 9 is a later addition as it seems to consist of commentarial matter. The second half of line 12 is the same as that of line 10 of ch.IV and line 13 is similar to Bu II. 193:

Tena vitthārikaṃ āsi lokanāthassa sāsanaṃ.

These two lines seem to have been inserted to connect up what follows. Lines 14 - 24 are almost the same as lines 5 - 15 of ch.IV. Lines 25 and 26 are metrically bad. These two lines and

lines 27 and 28 seem to be a later addition. Lines 29 - 31 are very similar to lines 27 - 29 of chapter IV. Line 31 is probably a later addition as it is an independent line.

Lines 34, 36 and 38 are irregular in metre. Line 43 is similar to Saṃ Nik. VI. 1.5.18:

Khināsavā arahanto bahu buddhassa sāvakā

Line 44 is similar to line 2 and lines 45 and 46 to 3 and 4. Lines 45 and 46 introduce the eight theras. Line 47 is the same as line 102 of ch.IV. Lines 59 and 60 are similar to 5 and 6. Lines 71 and 72 are very similar to lines 27 and 28. Lines 92 and 93 are a repetition of lines 8 and 81. Line 95 is metrically correct if the word bhikkhavo is omitted. Lines 97, 98 and 99 are also irregular. Lines 103 - 106 repeat lines 90 - 93. Line 102, like line 89 seems to have been inserted to introduce the passage. Line 114 is also irregular in metre.

Lines 116 - 123 are a prophecy and are in the future tense. Lines 124 and 125 seem to be an interpolation, as the verb here is not in the future tense. Line 118 is similar to J. 507 G.1:

Brahmaloka cavitvāna devaputto mahiddhiko

Line 131, which gives a list of names, does not conform to the metre, and gives commentarial matter. Lines 130 and 131 seem to be a later interpolation. The verb in line 130 is first person present, but the speaker is not mentioned. If this couplet is removed, the account

is more continuous. Line 132 forms an independent sentence and line 133 names the speaker of the next couplet. These two lines may also be later additions. In line 137 something seems to be missing. The couplet (lines 137 and 138) is badly constructed and is also not grammatical. The speaker is again not given. Line 138 is similar to J.538 G.43:

Avhayassu maṃ, bhaddan te, pabbajā mama rucati.

Line 139 is grammatically wrong. sambādhāya does not agree with gharāvāsā. Line 140 is similar to Par. Dīp p. 213 G.10.

Parivutā pāṇikoṭīhi pabbajiṃ jīnasāsane.

Line 142 is similar to line 31 of ch.IV. Line 144 partly repeats line 141 and lines 143 - 145 form a badly constructed sentence. Perhaps line 144 is a later addition.

Lines 146 - 220 are a chronological list. Line 146 is metrically right if tadā is omitted. Line 147 may be a later addition, as without it the couplet would be complete. Lines 157 - 160 seem to be an interpolation. The lines may refer to any bhikkhu, but as they stand they describe Siggava. The Mhvs tells us something of Siggava, but not what is said here. Line 158 is similar to line 26 of ch.IV. Line 160 is similar to Therag. 896:

Piṇḍapātapaṭikkanto eko adutiyo muni

and Therag, 1081:

Sobhati paṃsukūlena sīho va girigabbhare.

Lines 161 - 164 are almost the same as lines 58 - 61 of ch.IV., though

the order is not the same. Lines 165 - 167 are almost the same as lines 86 - 88 of ch.IV, but here it is forty instead of forty-five years. Lines 168 and 169 are similar to IV. 93 - 94. Line 169 is irregular in metre, and this seems to be a later change as IV. 94 is quite regular. Lines 171 - 173 repeat lines 146 - 148. Line 174 is also irregular. Line 177 seems to be an independent sentence. Lines 178 - 179 are almost the same as IV. 76 - 77. Line 180 is similar to IV. 89. Lines 186 - 187 are a repetition of lines 149 - 150. Lines 190 - 191 are almost the same as IV. 72 - 73, and lines 192 - 193 as IV. 78 - 79. Lines 194 - 195 are also almost the same as IV. 91 - 92. Lines 198 - 199 almost repeat lines 153 - 154. Lines 207 is irregular in metre. Lines 208 - 209 repeat IV. 80 - 81. Line 220 is similar to Par. Dīp.p.69 G.10:

Sāsanaṃ jotayitvāna somadditvā kutitthiye
Veneyye vinayitvāna nibbuto so sasāvako.

Lines 222 - 231 are a repetition of lines 192 - 101. Line 221 was probably introduced to connect up the passage.

## Chapter VI.

Lines 1 - 2 appear to be a couplet from a chronological list. It is not clear what vaso in line 6 means. Lines 8, 11 and 14 seem to be a sort of refrain. Probably lines 6 - 7, 9 - 10, 12 - 13, formed a list of objects, and 8, 11 and 14 were added later to each of

the couplets respectively. Some parts of the account in Smp.p.42 are very similar in language to Dpvs lines 3,9,10,17,20,23 and 25. Line 25 is irregular in metre.Perhaps the words undurehi visodhitā were later added.Lines 29-30 seem to be a memorial verse.The story in its expanded form is given in Smp p.43.Line 31 is an ~~indefinite~~ independent line and is similar to Bu XIV.1:

Durāsado asamasamo piyadassī mahāyaso

The other line (32) seems to have no connection with this. Lines 33-35 form one sentence.Perhaps line 32 is a later addition as this detail is omitted in the Smp.After line 37 something is omitted, or lines 38 and 39 are an interpolation.Lines 42-45 also do not seem to be quite appropriate here.Line 38 is similar to Cp.III. 4. 5:

Sp pi maṃ anusikkhanto pabbajjam samarocayi.

Line 41 is similar to Dhmp G.368:

Mettāvihārī yo bhikkhu,pasanno Buddhasāsane.

and line 44 to Cp I.1.1:

Etthantare yaṃ caritaṃ sabbaṃ taṃ bodhipācanaṃ.

Line 49 partly repeats line 47, and lines 51 - 52 are similar in substance to lines 3 - 4. Line 53 is an independent line and is meaningless here. Line 54 seems to go better with line 61. Lines 55 - 60 form a list and were probably introduced later as commentarial matter. Line 60 is similar to Therīgāthā 184:

Ito bahiddhā pāsaṇḍā diṭṭhiyo upanissitā.

Line 65 is grammatically wrong as the form desanaṃ is impossible here.

Lines 67 - 69 form one sentence. Probably line 67 was introduced for the sake of linking up with what follows. Line 72 form an independent sentence. It is grammatically wrong, and seems to be an interpolation. Line 76 is irregular in metre, and is similar to Smp p.45, lines 4 - 6: Sīhapañjare ṭhito addasa Nigrodhaṃ sāmaneraṃ rājaṅgaṇena gacchantaṃ dantam guttaṃ satindriyam iriyāpathasampannaṃ. Line 90 is similar to Par. Dīp. V. p.50 G.2:

Panthamhi samaṇaṃ disvā santacittaṃ samāhitaṃ

Lines 77 - 84 and 86 - 87 consist only of epithets. Some of these lines, if not all, may be later additions. Line 87 partly repeats line 76, and is not grammatically correct. Line 88 belongs to a different metre and seems to have been introduced for the purpose of linking up what follows. Lines 89 and 90 and 93 - 95 are irregular in metre. In line 94 nayehi is grammatically incorrect. It probably stands for ānehi or has been influenced by forms like desehi. Asantayi in line 102 may also be the result of the influence of other aorist forms. Nisīdayī in line 99 is impossible as an imperative. It may be due to a mistake in copying or, as Franke suggests, it may be the result of a vague remembrance of J. 545 G.238:

So Paṇṇako Kurunam kattusettham
Nisīdayī paccato āsanasmin.

Line 100 seems to be incomplete. From line 104 the phrase disvā rājā taruṇaṃ kumārakaṃ should be omitted. Then the metre is regular. Line 106 also seems to be incomplete. Lines 109 - 110 and 117 - 118

are clearly interpolations. They are also in a different metre. Lines 109 - 110 are the same as Dhmp. G.21 or J.520 G.1., and lines 117 - 118 are the same as Saṃ. Nik VI. 1.5.18. The metre changes again with line 123, and this and line 124 seem to have been introduced to link up the two ballads. Dūtassa in line 123 is not correct as more than one is referred to in line 121. There is repetition in line 124. It is perhaps due to the fact that the second half of the line has been influenced by J.545 G.190:

Mittāmacce ca suhajje puttadāre ca bandhave.

Line 126 is similar to J. 539 G.9:

So ahaṃ vāyamissāmi yathāsattiṃ yathābalaṃ

Line 131 is an independent line. In line 132 vīthi sammajjantu te does not seem to be grammatically correct and may have been influenced by Par. Dīp.V. p. 14 G.3:

Vīthisamajjanam katvā kadalīpuṇṇakaddhaje.

The line is also metrically weak. Lines 138 - 140 form one sentence. Line 138 may have been later introduced. It is similar to J.362 G.4:

Khattiyā brāhmaṇā, vessā, suddā caṇḍālapukkusā.

Lines 141 and 142 are irregular in metre. In line 141 sabbañ ca tālāvacaram is in the accusative but should be in the nominative. Perhaps the error is due to the direct borrowing of the phrase from J.545 G.61, where the accusative is correct:

Sabbañ ca tālāvacaram maṇimhi passa nimmitam.

Line 145 is metrically irregular, and this line and line 146 seem

to be badly constructed. Lines 147, 148 and 150 are metrically wrong . Lines 151 - 153 do not seem to be needed here. They form one sentence and interrupt the commands that are given. Or lines 151 - 153 may be connecting another passage which partly repeat lines 145 - 150. Line 156 is an independent sentence and is hardly appropriate here. Lines 157 - 159 form one sentence. Line 162 is grammatically irregular, and line 163 is similar to Par. Dīp. p.10 G.2:

Pasannacittā sumanā vedajātā katanjali.

Line 164 is also an independent sentence, and line 165 is not quite appropriate here. Lines 168 - 170 form one sentence. Again lines 175 - 177 form one sentence. Lines 175 - 177 repeat the subject matter of lines 168 - 170. Line 181 consists of commentarial matter, and lines 180 and 182 form a good couplet. Again lines 184 - 189 seem to be commentarial matter. Perhaps line 183 and 191 originally formed a couplet. If so, line 192 must also be a later addition. Lines 193 - 194 may have been influenced by Bu. I.81:

Madanimmadanaṃ sokanudaṃ saṃsāra‿parimocanaṃ
Sabbadukkhakkhayaṃ maggaṃ sakkaccaṃ paṭipajjathā.

Line 195 may have been introduced to link up what follows. Lines 195 - 197 form one sentence. Lines 201 - 203 are similar in language to Smp p.48: Rājā dhamme pasīditvā ekamekaṃ dhammakkhandhaṃ ekekavihārena pūjessamī'ti, ekadivasaṃ eva channavutikoṭi‿dhanam vissajjetvā amacce ānāpesi. Line 203 is metrically irregular.

Chapter VI does not seem to be a very satisfactory account. It most probably did not form a part of the Porāṇā. The account is obviously a compilation of various ballads.

## Chapter VII.

Lines 1 - 5 form one sentence. The second line is irregular in metre, and was probably added later. Lines 9 - 10 seem to be commentarial matter, and ~~they~~ are similar to VI. 133. Lines 12 - 14 form one sentence. Line 14 may be a later addition: there is no reference to it in the Smp or Mhvs. Lines 22 - 25 are obviously an interpolation as the verb in these lines is in the 3rd. person. Line 29 consists only of epithets, and is similar to J.544 G.113:

Paṇḍitaṃ sutasampannaṃ so maṃ atthe nivesayi.

Perhaps lines 29 - 30 are a later addition, and they hardly give any extra information. Lines 36 - 38 form one sentence, and lines 39 - 41 form another. Lines 36 and 39 begin with the usual sutvāna introduced to connect questions and answers. Lines 44 - 46 form one sentence. Line 51 is badly constructed. Line 54 is similar to J. 270. G.2:

Bhaṇa samma anuññāto atthaṃ dhammañ ca kevalam.

Lines 59 and 60 are grammatically weak. Lines 63 - 66 look like memorial verses. Line 67 is an independent line and seems to be badly constructed. These five lines may be an interpolation. Line 68 is similar to J. 541 G.11:

Ete ca aññe ca rājāno khattiyā brāhmaṇā bahū.

Line 71 gives a list of names. It may be commentarial matter. Line 73 seems to be an independent sentence. Lines 86 - 88 form one sentence. Line 86 occurs in another connection in Smp. p.62. Lines 86 - 87 form a list, and line 88, which partly repeats line 85, may have been introduced to form the sentence. Lines 84 - 88 may be a later addition, as they partly repeat what has been said earlier. Line 93 is similar to II. 117. Lines 99 - 100 are metrically irregular and may be a later addition. Line 101 is similar to VI. 117. Lines 102 - 104 are similar to V. 2 - 4. Line 111 is an independent sentence and may have been introduced later as commentarial matter. Line 114 also forms an independent sentence. Lines 116 - 118 are similar to V. 4 - 6.

## Chapter VIII.

Lines 1 - 3 form one sentence, and lines 4 - 6 form another. Line 5 is similar to Bu XXI. 2:

Dhammacakkam pavattesi anukampāya pāṇinam

Line 8 is more regular in Smp p.66:

Gantvā Kasmīragandhāraṃ isi majjhantiko tadā
Ruṭṭhaṃ nāgaṃ pasadetvā mocesi bandhanā bahū.

Line 10 is also different in Smp:

Codetvā Devadūtehi mocesi bandhanā bahū

Instead of lines 11 - 12 Smp (p.67) has:

Gantvāna Rakkhitatthero Vanavāsiṃ mahiddhiko

Antalikkhe ṭhito tattha desesi Anamataggiyaṃ.

and in place of lines 13 - 14:

Aparantaṃ vigāhitvā Yonako Dhammarakkhito

Aggikkhandhūpamen' ettha pasādesi jane bahū.

But the prose passage is more similar: Yonakadhammarakkhitatthero pi Aparantakam gantvā aggikkhandhūpamasuttantakathāya Aparantake pasādetvā. Line 14 in Dpvs VIII is metrically irregular. Again instead of lines 15 - 16 the Smp has:

Mahāraṭṭham isi gantvā so Mahādhammarakkhito

Jātakam kathayitvāna pasādesi mahājanam.

The prose passage again is closer: M. Mahāraṭṭhaṃ gantvā Mahānāradakassapajātakakathāya Maharaṭṭhake pasādetvā.

Lines 17 - 18 are similar to the lines in the Smp:

Yonakaraṭṭhaṃ tadā gantvā so Maharakkhito isi

Kālakārāmasuttena tepasādesi Yonake.

The Smp (p.68), like the Mhvs, gives the name of only one thera ~~that~~ who went to Himavant:

Gantvāna Majjhimatthero Himavantaṃ pasādayi

Yakkhasenaṃ pakāsento Dhammacakkapavattanam.

The Dpvs devotes three lines to this Mission alone, and line 20 is irregular in metre. Perhaps these three lines are a changed form. Instead of lines 22 - 23 the Smp has:

Suvaṇṇabhūmiṃ gantvāna Sonuttarā mahiddhikā

Pisāce niddhamitvāna Brahmajālaṃ adesayuṃ

## Chapter IX.

Lines 1 - 2 may have been introduced later as an introduction. Lines 3 - 8 appear to be memorial verses. Line 3 is similar to J.454 G.5:

Santi ańńe pi sasakā arańńe vanagocarā

and line 5 is similar to J.546 G. 129:

Yesaṃ khandhesu sobhanti kumārā cārudassanā

Line 8 perhaps was influenced by Bu V.3:

Māpesi nagaraṃ satthā dhammapuravaruttamaṃ.

The style of lines 9 and 10 is different. Instead of being terse it partly repeats line 8, and in itself there is repetition by the use of words raṭṭha and mahārajjaṃ. Since the next two lines are of the same style as lines 3 - 8 it is possible that this couplet (9 - 10) was introduced later to mark the geographical position of Sīhapura. Line 12 is similar to J.544 G.68:

Vijaya ca Sunāmo ca senāpati Alātako.

The phrase karoṭe vilopakammam is found in Ghata Jātaka (454). Line 15 is the same as the lines in J.545 G.185, J.538 G.68 and J.482 G.15. Line 19 is similar to J.545 G.190:

Mittamacce ca suhajje puttadāre ca bandhave.

Lines 19 - 20 may have been added later. The verb in this couplet is in the third person, while in the previous verse it is in the second person. Lines 21 - 22 should follow lines 23 - 24 as they interrupt the words of the king. Lines 34 - 35 may be commentarial

matter later added. Lines 37 and 38 are a badly constructed couplet. Line 38 has no connection with line 37. Kakkhalam pharusam is another phrase common to Ghata Jātaka. Lines 39-40 are obviously an interpolation. Lines 41-43 form one sentence. It is possible that line 41 is a later addition and that lines 2-3 originally followed line 12. Line 44 is an independent sentence. Line 47 is similar to J. 549. 4. ~~19.~~ 649

Idaṃ vatvāna Maghavā devarājā Sujampati.

Line 49 probably shows the influence of Sh. I. 9. 42:

Sakkassa vacanaṃ sutvā Vissukammo mahiddhiko

and J. 544. G. 127:

Sattamī ca gati deva: devaputto mahiddhiko.

Lines 41-50 seems to be an interpolation as they interrupt the story.

Lines 51-52 is not a continuation from line 38. According to line 38 Vijaya and his followers were in Suppāra, and according to line 43 they had reached Ceylon. Lines 51-52 therefore, may be a later addition. Line 52 is similar to J. 466. G. 8:

Taṃ eva nāvaṃ abhiruyha sabbe.

Lines 53-55 form a sentence. Line 53 is grammatically incorrect, and pilavantā 'va sāgaraṃ, a repetition of the phrase in line 29, is meaningless. This too is perhaps a later addition. Line 62 is irregular in metre. Lines 64 and 65 seem to be an interpolation; by themselves they are meaningless. Line 66 is similar to J. 545 G. 64:

Samajjā c' ettha vattanti ākiṇṇā naranāribhi.

Lines 69 and 73 are metrically irregular, and line 73 is similar to J. 539 G. 30:

Kadāhaṃ Mithilaṃ phītaṃ suvibhattantarāpanaṃ.

Lines 72-74 form one sentence, and line 74 consists only of epithets. It is possible that lines 62-74 did not form a part of the original story.

Line 87 is a repetition of 78, but the other lines of the couplets differ. Lines 77 and 78 are independent sentences. Lines 86 and 41 and 84 are similar to Bu XXV. 1:

Koṇāgamanassa aparena sambuddho dvipaduttamo
Kassapo nāma nāmena dhammarājā pabhaṅkaro.

Lines 79-87 form a chronological list. Line 85 is metrically irregular and forms an independent sentence. Lines 88-91 may be a later addition.

## Chapter X.

This chapter seems to consist only of memorial verses. Lines 2 and 3 are irregular in metre. The phrase Jambudīpā idhāgatā in line 2 is common in the Dpvs. Lines 5 and 6 form a list of names. Line 15 seems to have been influenced by J. 538 G. 35 or 60:

Visatiṃ c'eva vassāni tahiṃ rajjaṃ akārayiṃ.

## Chapter XI.

Lines 1-15 are in the same style as ch. X. Lines 3-5 repeat what is said in lines 1-2. Perhaps lines 1-2 are a later addition. Line 5

is irregular in metre like ch. X. 3. Line 9 also is metrically bad. Lines 13-14 form a list of names. Lines 16-29 form a chronological list. Line 17 is metrically right if tadā is omitted. Line 23 is meaningless, and it is an independent line. Perhaps it is an interpolation. Lines 24-26 are metrically irregular. Lines 27-29 form one sentence. Line 28 may have been added later as commentarial matter. The Smp (p.74) quotes four lines from the Dpvs. The first two are the same as lines 30-31, but the next two lines:

Nilādi yādisaṃ pupphaṃ pupphayaṭṭhiṃhi tādisaṃ

Sakuṇā sakuṇayatthimhi sarupen'eva saṇṭhitā

are not found in the Dpvs text. Lines 32-33 consists almost entirely of epithets, and many have been added later. In the Smp p.74 there is the phrase nīlapītalohitāvadātakāḷavaṇṇāni. Lines 34-35 are closer to the two lines omitted in the Dpvs text. Lines 43-44 are incomplete by themselves. Lines 45-48 are metrically quite irregular, and line 45 may have been influenced by Sutta Nipāta G. 690. in which the phrase pasannacitto giram abbhudīrayi occurs. Lines 43-44 are incomplete by themselves. Line 49 merely gives a list of persons and is similar to J. 532 G. 57:

Mātāpitā ca bhātā ca bhaginī nātī bhandhavā.

Line 50 is an independent line. Perhaps lines 43-50 are a later addition. Line 54 is similar to J. 502 G. 11:

Rājā me so dijo mitto sakhā pāṇasamo ca me.

Line 55 is almost the same as line 48, and is metrically irregular.

Lines 57-59 form one sentence. Lines 60-61 are clearly an interpolation. Line 60 is only a list of names, and both lines are metrically impossible. Line 65 is also metrically wrong and with 66 may have been added later. Lines 62-64 form one sentence. Lines 62 and 63 give a list and line 63, which is similar to line 61, may have been added to form a sentence. Line 72 is similar to J. 495 G. 21:

Harītakaṃ āmalakaṃ ambajambuvibhītakaṃ.

Line 75 is an independent sentence. Lines 76 - 78 form one sentence. The phrase Asokadhammena pesitam in line 77 occurs again in line 79. Line 81 is an independent sentence. It partly repeats line 80. Lines 82 - 83 are a badly consetructed couplet and they seem to have no connection with the preceding verses. It is not said where Mahinda spent the three months or why he is called the seventh.

Chapter XI is not a satisfactory compilation. The list of kings at the beginning, the wonderful things that happened at the coronation of Devānaṃpiya Tissa, and the list of things Asoka sent probably existed at first; the rest may have been added gradually. This chapter also does not seem to have formed a part of the Porāṇā, the contents of which are mentioned at the beginning of the Dpvs.

## Chapter XII.

Lines 1 - 13 more or less repeat the contents of XI.67-74,

though the passage is fuller in detail. Lines 1 - 8 form a list and line 9 seems to have been introduced to make a sentence. Lines 1 and 10 are almost the same as J.538 G.72:

Vālavīṭjanim unhīsam khaggam chattam ca pandaram

and Dhmp G.190:

Yo ca Buddhañ ca dhammañ ca saranam gato.

The Smp quotes lines 1 - 13 from the Dpvs but has vatamsam for gangodakam, sukāhatam for sukamāhatam, and saddhāsaranam upehi for saranam upehi satthuno. Lines 14 and 15 form a very bad couplet. It is grammatically incorrect, and repeats the phrases Asokadhammo mahāyaso and pāhesi Devānampiyassa. This couplet seems to have been introduced to explain the preceding couplets. Line 7 is similar to XII.72, and line 20 to VII.28. Lines 22 - 23 are similar to J.545. G.173:

Vanditvā sirasā pāde katvā ca nam padakkhinam
Vidhuro avoca rājānam paggahetvāna añjalim.

Line 24 is in the style of the Bu. Line 26 seems to be an interpolation, as the next line refers to ime pañca mahātherā. Chalabhiññā mahiddhiko is a phrase common in the Bu and it is repeated in line 27. The Smp (p.70) quotes from the Porāṇā lines 24 - 27, but they are followed by the two lines:

Bhanduko sattamo tesam diṭṭhasacco upāsako
Iti ete mahānāgā mantayimsu rahogatā.

Lines 30 - 32 form one sentence, and 32 seems to be meaningless here. Lines 30 - 31 and 33 - 34 follow each other better without line 32. Line 35 is almost the same as Cp I.8.3:

Mama saṅkappaṃ aññāya Sakko devānaṃ issaro.

Line 37 is similar to Bu I.67:

Kālo deva mahāvīra upajja mātukucchiyaṃ,

and 38 is similar to VIII.5.

Line 39 partly repeats line 38 and is similar to Therīgāthā 306:

Sabbadukkhappahānāya dhammam desesi pāṇinaṃ

and line 40 is similar to Bu XXVII.16:

So pi buddho kāruṇiko satte mocesi bandhanā

Line 41 is an independent sentence. Line 42 is badly constructed and ~~renders~~ has little meaning unlike line 46. Lines 45 - 47 form one sentence. Perhaps line 44 is a later addition as its meaning is not complete. Line 49 is similar to VI.193. Line 50 is an independent sentence and partly repeats ~~partly~~ line 48.

Line 51 is similar to J.545 G.161:

Kālaññū samayaññū ca sa rājavasatiṃ vase.

Lines 53 and 54 form a list; probably they are an interpolation. Line 58 is similar to Bu I.49:

Sādhū ti te paṭisutvā nipakā saṃvutindriyā

This may be a later addition, as the next two lines form a couplet by themselves.

Line 62 is similar to Bu II.60:

Ussīsake maṃ ṭhatvāna idaṃ vacanaṃ abravi

and lines 61 and 62 ~~is~~ are an introductory couplet for the prose account of the story of the coming of Mahinda. This prose account is quite different from that given by the Smp. Only the first sentence is similar: Sammāsambuddhena ca tumhe vyākatā: anāgate Mahindo nāma Tambapannidīpaṃ pasādessati. The last six lines of the third paragraph are in the style of later literature, where the use of compounds is common. The phrase tantākulakajātā gulāguṇathikajātā muñjababbajabhūta occurs in Ang.Nik.Vol.II.p.213.

Lines 63 - 65 are almost a repetition of lines 48 - 50. Lines 66 - 71 are given in the Smp as taken from the Porāṇā. Instead of ramme in line 66 the Smp has rājagahe, but this is abviously an error. For the second line the Smp has:

Kālo ca gamanassā'ti gacchāmi dīpam uttamam

and this is a better constructed sentence. In line 71 Missaka is omitted and thus the metre is corrected. Line 68 may have been influenced by Par Dīp.V.p.40 G.6. Lines 72 - 73 are a repetition of lines 24 - 25 and line 74 of line 54. Line 76 is similar to Lines 69 - 69 and lines 77 - 78 are almost the same as lines 70 - 71. It is significant that line 74 is different from line 26. According to line 76 only Mahinda flies. Lines 81 - 83 form one sentence. Line 84 is irregular in metre and seems to be commentarial matter that has been added later. It is similar to J.423 G.6:

Gimhānaṃ pacchime māse vātaṃ icchanti paṇḍitā

Line 85 is a mere repetition. Line 92 seems to contradict line 91. In the Smp p.73 the passage runs thus: Mahindatthero rājānaṃ avidūre āgacchantaṃ disvā, mamaṃ yeva rājā passatu. Lines 94 - 95 and 98 are clearly interpolations; they may be commentarial matter. Line 96 is similar to J.529 G.8:

Kapano vatāyaṃ bhikkhu muṇḍo saṃghāṭipāruto.

Lines 99 - 100 are quoted in Smp p.74, and lines 101 - 102 in p.76. Line 101 is similar to Cp. I.10.15:

Phoṭetvā rajagate gatte ekamantaṃ upāvasi.

Lines 103 - 104 repeat the subject matter of lines 101 - 102. The false Accusative in line 107 may be, as Franke suggests, the result of the influence of J.530 G.1:

Disva nisinnaṃ rājānaṃ brahmadattaṃ rathesabham.

Lines 108 - 109 are a repetition of VI. 116 - 117. They are quoted also in Smp p.67. Line 115 is similar to Bu I.18:

Namassamānā nipatanti tuṭṭhahaṭṭhā pamoditā.

Lines 117 - 118 seem to be an interpolation as line 119 dught to follow line 116. This couplet has many epithets. Line 122 is similar to line 116. Lines 123 - 126 form one sentence, and it is grammatically wrong. Perhaps this is an interpolation, as Smp also makes no reference to these incidents. Line 127 is grammatically incorrect and something is missing before line 126. Line 128 is similar to line 121. Lines 128 - 130 form one sentence. Line 130 is similar to Bu II.39:

Orohitvāna gaganā mānuse pucchi tāvade.

and line 133 to J.534 G.41:

Khalu saññamāno rājā amacce ajjhabhāsatha.

Line 135 consists of a list of persons. Lines 139 - 142 consist merely of descriptive epithets, and seem to be an interpolation. The form nisiditum in line 148 may be due to the influence of paveditum in line 147. Lines 151 - 152 are irregular in metre. They, like line 148, lay down a rule. The sentence uccāsayanamahāsayanam na kappati in Smp p.79 is similar to line 151. Perhaps lines 151 - 152 are a later interpolation. Line 153 is similar to Cp II. 1.4:

Tassa tam vacanam sutvā rājā pi tuṭṭhamānaso

and line 156 to J.534 G.40:

So luddo haṃsakācena rājadvāram upāgami.

Line 159 is an independent sentence and partly repeats line 158. It is probably an interpolation. Lines 162 - 164 form a sentence, and lines 165 - 167 form another. Line 167 partly repeats line 165. Perhaps line 165 is a later addition. Line 170 is a repetition of line 113 and line 172 is similar to Bu III.4:

Koṭisatasahassānam paṭhamābhisamayo ahu.

## Chapter XIII.

The speakers of lines 5 - 6 and 7 - 8 are not given. Line 17 is an independent sentence. Lines 17 - 18 are similar to Bu XII.5 - 6:

Navutikoṭisahassānam dutiyābhisamayo ahu

Punāparam amitayaso catusaccam pakāsayi.

Lines 19 - 20 and 21 - 22 are badly formed couplets. Line 23 is similar to line 11. This and lines 24, 25 and 26 are independent sentences. Line 25 partly repeats line 24, and line 26 is similar to I.63. Lines 27 - 29 form one sentence, and line 30 is an independent sentence. Perhaps line 30 was introduced to connect what follows. The sentence in Smp p.81 is similar to lines 28 - 30: Therassa Nandanavane āgatāgatāhi kulitthīhi kulasuṇhāhi kulakumārīhi saddhiṃ Sammodamānass' eva sāyaṇhasamayo jāto. The speakers of the next three statements are not given. Lines 33 - 35 form one sentence, and line 33 consists only of epithets. The word accāsannan is used in Smp in describing the Mahāmeghavana. Lines 36 - 37 are also similar to a sentence in Smp p.81:- Etam Mahāmeghavanam nāma uyyānam mama pitu santakaṃ nagarato nātidūran nāccāsannam gamanāgamanasampannaṃ ettha therā vāsam kappentu. The description of the Mahāmegha Park and the presentation of it is similar to that of Veluvaṇa presented by Bimbisāra (Mahāvagga I.22 15 - 18): "Atha kho bhagavā yena rañño Māgadhassa Seniyassa Bimbisārassa nivesanaṃ ten' upasaṃkami upasaṃkamitvā paññatte āsane nisīdi saddhiṃ bhikkhusaṃghena. Atha kho rājā Māgadho Seniyo Bimbisāro buddhapamukham bhikkhusaṃghaṃ paṇītena khādaniyena bhojaniyena sahatthā santappetvā sampavāretvā bhagavantaṃ bhuttāviṃ onītapattapāṇiṃ ekamantaṃ nisīdi. Ekamantaṃ nisinnassa kho rañño Māgadhassa Seniyassa Bimbisārassa etad ahosi: kattha nu kho bhagavā vihareyya, yaṃ assa gāmato n' eva avidūre

na accāsanne gamanāgamana‿sampannaṃ atthikānaṃ-atthikānaṃ manussānaṃ abhikkamanīyaṃ divā appākinnaṃ rattiṃ appasaddaṃ appanigghosaṃ vijanavātaṃ manussarāhaseyyakaṃ paṭisallānasāruppan ti. Atha kho rañño Māgadhassa Seniyassa Bimbisārassa etad ahosi: idam kho amhākaṃ Veḷuvanaṃ uyyānaṃ gāmato n' eva avidūre na accāsanne gamanāgama‿nasampannaṃ atthikānaṃ-atthikānaṃ manussānaṃ abhikkamanīyaṃ divā appākiṇṇaṃ, rattiṃ appasaddaṃ appanigghosaṃ vijanavātaṃ manussarāhaseyyakaṃ paṭisallānasāruppaṃ. yaṃ nūnāhaṃ Veḷuvanaṃ uyyānaṃ buddhapamukhassa bhikkhusaṃghassa dadeyyan ti. Atha kho rājā Māgadho Seniyo Bimbisāro sovaṇṇamayaṃ bhiṅkāraṃ gahetvā bhagavato onojesi etāhaṃ bhante Veḷuvanaṃ uyyānaṃ buddhapamukhassa bhikkhusaṃghassa dammīti. Paṭiggahesi bhagavā ārāmaṃ. Atha kho bhagavā rājānaṃ Māgadhaṃ Seniyaṃ Bimbisāraṃ dhammiyā kathāya sandassetvā samādapetvā samuttejetvā sampahaṃsetvā uṭṭhāyāsanā pakkāmi. Atha kho bhagavā etasmiṃ nidāne dhammikathaṃ katvā bhikkhū āmantesi: anujānāmi bhikkhave ārāman ti."

Lines 40 - 45 consist only of epithets and may be later additions. Line 48 seems to be a connecting line, and line 49 is not quite regular metrically. The speaker of lines 56 - 57 is not given. Lines 58 - 59 seem to have been influenced by Cp. I. 8.10:

Tassāhaṃ vacanaṃ sutvā haṭṭho saṃviggamānaso
Katanjali vedajāto idam vacanam abravi.

and Cp III. 3.3:

Anjalim paggahetvāna idaṃ vacanaṃ abravi.

Line 60 is clearly an interpolation. The form dadantaṃ in line 65 is grammatically incorrect. Lines 67 - 68 form a bad couplet. This couplet most probably is an interpolation. Line 69 repeats line 67. Line 71 is an independent line, and ~~it~~ is similar to Bu XIII.12:

Lake acchariyaṃ disvā abbhutaṃ lomahaṃsanaṃ

Line 72 is also an independent sentence. Lines 73 - 74 also form a bad couplet, and vihāraṃ is grammatically wrong. Line 75 also seems to have been influenced by Bu XIII.12, and the next line of the couplet is grammatically weak. One verb is in the past tense and the other is in the present tense. Line 77 consists of many epithets, and line 78 is grammatically weak, unlike line 95. Line 82 is weak both metrically and grammatically. Line 83 is also full of epithets, and line 84 is badly constructed. Line 88 is similar to line 79. Line 91 is an independent sentence. Sabbe kaṅkhā is grammatically incorrect. Vihārehi probably stands for vitārehi. Line 96 is almost a repetition of line 88. Perhaps line 100 has been inserted to make up the couplet. Lines 102 - 103 are a weak couplet. In line 104, which forms an independent sentence, the form patiṭṭhissaṃ is grammatically impossible. Line 105 is similar to line 58 and lines 106 - 107 to

lines 95 - 96. Lines 109 - 110 are similar to lines 81 - 82, and 75 - 76. In line 110 Pavatthita is grammatically impossible. Perhaps it is the result of the influence of J.547 G.784:

Celukkhepo avattitha āgate dhanadāyake.

Similarly in line 112 tava chandavasānugā is grammatically impossible and may be due to the influence of J.534 G.80:

Puttārūpayasūpeta tavacchandavasānugā.

Line 116 is similar to line 107. Line 118 repeats line 98. Line 124 seems to be a connecting link, and lines 125 - 126 are similar to lines 106 - 107 and lines 28- 29 to lines 109 - 110. Line 131 is grammatically incorrect. Byākarohi is singular and vitāratha is plural.

## Chapter XIV.

Line 1 is similar to XIII.124. Lines 5 and 6 ate similar to lines 109 - 110. Lines 9 - 12 form one sentence. Lines 13 - 14 are similar to XIII. 81 - 82. Lines 15 - 17 form one sentence. Line 15 may be a later addition. Line 18 is an independent sentence. Line 21 is similar to J. 545 G. 17:

Tato so Varuṇo nāgo nikkhamitvā nivesanā.

and to line XIII. 9, and line 22 to XIII. 21. Lines 19 - 23 form one sentence. Line 24 is an independent sentense, and is similar to XIII. 26. Lines 27 - 33 are almost a repetition of lines 15 - 21. It is significant that in line 15 the word Tissārāma does not

occur. Line 36 is an independent sentence and is metrically bad. Line 37 is almost a repetition of line 25, and line 38 is similar to J. 541 G.26:

Āsanā vuṭṭhahitvāna pamukho rathaṃ āruhi.

Line 39 is an independent sentence. Line 40 is also an independent sentence and may have been added later to name the speaker of the following couplet. It has the peculiar accusative form theranaṃ. Line 42 is very badly constructed. The speaker of line 43 is not named. Line 44 is grammatically incorrect. Line 45 is metrically irregular. Lines 45 - 48 seem to be commentarial matter. Line 49 is an independent sentence. Line 50 is similar to J.546 G.140:

Tiṇṇo hiyyo rājā gaṅgam sāmacco saparijjano.

Line 54 is an independent sentence anf lines 57 - 63 form one sentence. Lines 57 - 61 are found in an interpolation in the Mhvs Text (p.331) drawn from the simākathā (M Ṭ p.257 and Mahābodhivaṃsa G.134) Line 64 is similar to line 59. Lines 70 - 71 are similar to XIII. 118 - 119, and simārāmo is grammatically wrong. It is also strange that line 69 should record the first earthquake. Line 72 is metrically irregular. Lines 74 - 76 form one sentence and the construction of the sentence is very bad. Lines 77 - 78 are similar to XII. 121 - 122. Line 80 is clearly an interpolation, and line 79 seems to have been introduced to make up the couplet. Lines 82 - 90 are almost the

same as XIV. 27 - 35. Line 81 may have been a later addition. Lines 91 - 93 form one sentence. Lines 91 - 92 give a list and line 93 seems to have been added to form a sentence. Lines 91 - 93 are also metrically irregular. Again lines 94 - 96 form one sentence and 97 - 99 another. Lines 102 - 106 are almost the same as lines 83 - 87. Hence lines 100 - 101 and 107 may have been added later. Line 109 is similar to line 38 and line 110 to XIII. 21. Line 111 is similar to J.455 G.8:

Muhuttaṃ assasitvāna agamā yena pabbato.

and line 118 to J.547 G.256:

Tatthanahātvā pivitvā ca assāsetvā saputtake.

Lines 116 - 118 form one sentence and they interrupt the account. Line 122 is similar to XII. 157, and line 125 to Dhmp G.286:

Idha vassaṃ vassissāmi, idha hemanta gimhisu.

The speakers of lines 125 - 132 are not given. Line 126 is grammatically wrong. Lines 137 - 138 form a list. Line 139, which is similar to line 122, is irregular in metre, and may have been added to form a sentence with lines 137 - 138. Lines 140 - 141 are similar to Theragāthā 835:

Mayaṃ pi pabbajissāma varapaññassa santike

and Theragāthā 836:

Brahmacāriyaṅ carissāma bhagavā tava santike

Line 142 seems to be a connecting line. Line 143 has the peculiar Accusative form. Perhaps ~~they~~ these lines were later introduced to name the speaker. Lines 144 and 145 are a badly formed couplet. Lines 137 - 145 seem to be an interpolation. Lines 146 - 147 are a repetition of lines 77 - 78, and line 148 of line 45. Line 149 is similar to line 136. Lines 148 - 149 are also a badly formed couplet. Perhaps they came to be added as commentarial matter. Lines 152 - 156 form one sentence. Line 157 is not grammatically correct. Lines 159 - 161 form one sentence. Line 163 is metrically irregular.

## Chapter XV.

In line 4 the Accusative form dīpānaṃ occurs. The speakers of these and succeeding lines are not given. Line 5 is similar to J.547 G.36:

Annapānan ca yo dajjā vattha‿senāsanāni ca.

Lines 7 and 8 are grammatically wrong, and in line 9 aññātaṃ is also incorrect. Lines 11 and 12 are metrically irregular. Lines 12 and 13 are similar to the statement in Smp p.84: Asokaṃ dhammarājānaṃ upasaṃkamitvā mama vacanena evaṃ vadehi: sahāyo te mahārāja Devanaṃpiya Tisso Buddhasāsane pasanno thūpaṃ patiṭṭhāpetukāmo. Lines 15 and 16 contain only epithets and with lines 17 form one sentence. Line 16 is similar to Bu II. 154:

Yathāpi pabbato selo acalo suppatiṭṭhito

Line 18 is similar to line 12, and lines 20 - 21 are a repetition of lines 13 - 14, but here kāhati is correct. Line 22 is similar to Bu II. 43:

Tattha ṭhatvā vicintesiṃ tuṭṭho saṃviggamānaso.

Line 24 is similar to line 15. Lines 27 - 29 are almost a repetition of lines 19 - 21, and lines 30 - 31 are similar to lines 22 - 23. It is significant that Mahinda does not ask Sumana to go to Kosiya. Line 34 consists mainly of epithets, and line 35 is metrically irregular. Lines 38 - 40 are a little different from the lines quoted in Smp p.85:

Puṇṇamāyaṃ mahāviro cātumāsiniyā idha
Agantvā devalokamhā hatthikumbhe paṭiṭṭhito.

Line 41 is an independent sentence. Line 42 is grammatically incorrect and may have been influenced by Cp I 9.14:

Akampi tattha paṭhavi Sineruvanavatamsakā

Line 47 is an independent sentence. Lines 48 - 52 form one sentence. Line 49 is metrically irregular. Line 50 is grammatically wrong and there is repetition in line 51. Line 53 is not grammatical. Lines 55 and 56 are another badly formed couplet. Line 59 is metrically weak and lines 59 - 60 consist of a list of articles. Line 62 is grammatically incorrect. Perhaps lines 59 - 66 are a later addition. Lines 67 and 68 may have been influenced by Bu XXIII. 10:

Sopi maṃ muni vyākāsi Kakusandho vināyako

and XXIII. 7:

Cattāli^sa^sahassānaṃ tadā asi samāgamo.

Lines 69 - 72 form one sentence. Perhaps lines 71 - 72 are a later addition. Line 73 is almost a repetition of line 68. Lines 75 - 76 are a memorial verse. Line 78 consists only of epithets, and lines 77 - 78 seem to be a later addition. Lines 81 and 84 are independent lines. Line 88 may have been influenced By Bu XXIV. 8:

Taṃsabhikkhu^sahassānaṃ tadā āsi samāgamo.

Line 89 is metrically irregular. This and the next line are independent sentences. Lines 91 - 94 are almost a repetition of lines 71 - 74. Line 93 is a repetition of line 88. Lines 95 - 96 are a memorial verse. Lines 97 - 98 are a badly formed couplet. In line 97 the meaning of the word yonakā is not clear. In Sutta-Nipāta G.936 the phrase macche appodake yathā occurs and in G.777 is the phrase macche va appodake khīṇasote. In line 99 the word devo is hardly appropriate. Line 103 is a repetition of line 83 and is an independent sentence. Line 104 is similar to line 82. Line 106 is an independent sentence. Line 107 may have been influenced by Bu XXV. 38:

Brahmunā yācito santo Kassapo lokanāyako.

and line 108 by XXV. 9:

Vīsatibhikkhusahassānaṃ tadā āsi samāgamo.

Line 111 may have been influenced by Bu II.60:

Dīpaṃkaro lokavidū āhūtīnaṃ paṭiggaho.

Line 112 is metrically irregular. Lines 113 - 114 are almost a

repetition of lines 91 - 92. Line 118 is similar to Bu XVII.1:

Nīharitvā tamaṃ sabbaṃ suriyo abbhuggato yathā.

Lines 119 - 120 are a memorial verse. Lines 121 - 122 are similar to lines 101 - 102. Lines 125 - 126 are a repetition of lines 82 - 83. Lines 127 - 128 are similar to lines 105 - 106 or lines 85 - 86. Line 131 is similar to Bu I.72:

Bhagavā catamhi samaye lokajeṭṭho narāsabho.

Lines 135 - 136 are a badly formed couplet. In line 137 the word ahaṃ is meaningless. Perhaps it is the result of the influence of Bu XXVI. 17:

Ahaṃ Gotamo sambuddho saranaṃ sabbapāṇinaṃ

Lines 137 and 138 are a memorial verse. The speaker of the prophecy contained in lines 141 - 146 is not mentioned. Lines 143 - 144 are not in the same style as lines 101 - 102 or lines 121 - 122. Line 143 is similar to J.547 G.343:

Tassā vidūre pokkharaṇī bhūmibhāge manorame.

Lines 145 - 146 are independent sentences. Line 147 may have been influenced by Saṃ.Nik.I.5.9 G.7:

Buddhe pasannā dhammeca saṃghe ca tibbagāravā.

The words of the queen referred to in line 149 are not given. Line 150 is a repetition of line 147. Line 151 is similar to line 148. Lines 152 - 154 form one sentence, and the speaker of

the lines is not given. Line 152 is not quite accurate as the the bhikkhus alone could not confer the pabbajjā on a bhikkhunī. Lines 155 - 157 give a list. Lines 159 - 160 consist of epithets only. Line 161 seems to have been added to form a sentence. Perhaps lines 155 - 161 are a later addition. Line 162 does not seem to be grammatically correct, and line 163 is metrically irregular. After this something is missing, or line 164 is meaningless. Lines 164 - 166 form one sentence. Lines 167 - 170 also form one sentence and the sentence is badly constructed. Line 169 is similar to Par.Dīp p.26 G.11:

Itthi|sabbaṅga‿sampannā abhijātā jutindharā.

These four lines are an interpolation. Line 175 is badly constructed. Line 178 is similar to line 176. Line 179 is an independent sentence and seems to be meaningless. Line 180 is not grammatically correct and line 181 is similar to J.538 G.120:

Hitvā sampaddavi rājā pabbajjāya purrakkhato.

Line 185 is similar to line 179 and seems also to be meaningless. Lines 186 - 187 are not grammatically correct. Line 190 is a repetition of line 181.

## Chapter XVI.

Line 4 is similar to J.547 G.444:

Anuppatto brahārannaṃ, tam me akkāhi pucchito.

Line 5 partly repeats line 1. Lines 11 - 12 are a badly formed

couplet. The meaning is also not clear. Lines 9 - 12 seem to be an interpolation. Line 11 is similar to Cp II. 71:

Mātaṅgo nāma kāmena sīlavā susamāhito.

Lines 15 - 17 form one sentence. Lines 15 - 16 give a list and line 17 helps to form the sentence. Lines 20 - 21 are the same as Bu I.19. Line 22 is similar to Bu I.18:

Namassamāna nipatanti tuṭṭhahaṭṭhā pamoditā.

Line 23 is similar to J.541 G.158:

Yattha devā tāvatiṃsā sabbe Indapurohitā.

Line 24 is similar to Bu II. 72:

Ukkuṭṭhi saddā vattanti appoṭhenti hasanti ca.

Lines 25 - 26 may have been influenced by the Dīgha Nikāya XX. 9:

Purimaṃ disaṃ Dhataraṭṭho dakkhiṇena Virūḷhako
Pacchimena Vipūpakkho Kuvero uttaraṃ disaṃ
Cattaro te mahārājā samantā caturodisā.

Lines 22, 24, 29 and 32 are similar. Line 32 is an independent sentence. Line 33 may have been influenced by Bu II.51:

Campakaṃ saḷalaṃ nīpaṃ nāgapunnāgaketakaṃ.

Lines 39 - 42 give a list of flowers, and line 43 helps to form the sentence. Line 45 is very similar to line 29. Line 49 is a repetition of line 36. Lines 52 - 54 are a repetition of lines 29 - 31. Line 57 is similar to J.545 G.118:

Tattha naccanti gāyanti avahayanti varāvaraṃ

and line 58 is similar to J.545 G.65:

Passa malle samajjasmiṃ poṭhente digunaṃ bhujaṃ.

Line 60 is not grammatically correct. Line 61 is similar to J.529 G.4:

Ujuvaṃsā mahāsālā kilobhāsā manoramā.

Lines 64 - 65 are not grammatically correct, and the couplet is also badly formed. Line 65 is similar to J.547 G.579:

Bhunja khuddesi saṃyuttaṃ saha puttehi khattiya.

There is nowhere else a reference to the sons of Devānaṃpiya Tissa. Lines 63 - 66 form one sentence. Lines 67 and 68 are an independent sentence, and line 68 is also not grammatical. Both these may be later additions. Line 71 is an independent sentence. Lines 72 - 73 are badly constructed and seem to be an interpolation. Lines 71 - 78 are not quite satisfactory. Perhaps this part as well as the following lines are a later addition. Lines 80 and 82 are similar to Bu XXV. 24:

Anāsavā santacittā vītarāgā samāhitā

Line 85 is an independent sentence.

## Chapter XVII.

Line 2 is similar to J.427 G.3:

Sāgarena parikkhitaṃ cakkaṃ va parimaṇḍalam

Lines 5 - 7 are a memorial verse. Line 8 is an independent sentence and is similar to Par.Dīp. V. p.151 G.105:

Taṃ ahaṃ kittayissāmi sunātha mama bhāsato.

Lines 26 - 28 are incomplete. The meaning of dīpaṃ in line 6 is also not clear. Line 58 is an independent sentence. Line 59 repeats the subject matter of line 58. Line 60 is clearly an interpolation. Line 61 is also an independent sentence. Lines 62 - 64 form one sentence. Line 71 is similar to J.545 G.119:

Udentaṃ arunuggamhi Upakārim upāgami.

Lines 71 - 74 form one sentence. Lines 71 - 72 are merely descriptions. Line 83 is an independent sentence. The speaker of lines 84 - 85 is not given. Line 86 is an independent sentence. The speaker of lines 89 - 95 is also not given. Lines 92 - 93 consist mainly of epithets. Line 118 is not grammatical. The phrase sasamuddaṃ sapabbataṃ is correct in J.536 G.53:

Rājā da paṭhavim sabbam sasamuddaṃ sapabbataṃ.

Line 124 may have been influenced by Saṃ.Nik. XI. 2.8, G.7:

Cattaro ca mahārājā Tidasā ca yasassino,

and line 126 is similar to J.523 G.43:

Tāvatiṃsā ca ye devā Tidāsānañ ca Vāsavo.

Line 133 is similar to XVI. 58, line 147 to XV. 143, and line 148 to Bu II. 197:

Yadā ca devabhavanamhi buddho dhammaṃ adesayi.

Lines 148 and 151 are metrically irregular. Lines 155 - 158 are almost a repetition of XI. 12 - 15. Line 161 is a repetition of VI. 44. Lines 159 - 161 form one sentence. Lines 162 - 165 are similar to VI 1 - 4, and line 168 to XIII. 58. Line 171 is metrically irregular. Lines 172 - 180 are a repetition of XII. 1 - 9. Line 182 is metrically irregular. According to line 187 Devānaṃpiya Tissa is the builder of Mahācetiya. In line 189 the word Tissārāmaṃ is perhaps a copyist's error. Line 200 is metrically irregular. Line 208 is borrowed from Cp I. 9.25, and the speaker of lines 208 - 209 is not given. Perhaps these two lines are a later interpolation. Line 210 is similar to Cp II.6.10:

Rājā sutvāna vacanaṃ ussuṃ tassa vikappayi.

Line 218 is almost a repetition of line 212. Line 224 is an independent sentence and is badly constructed. Line 225 is also an independent sentence and is not quite appropriate here.